

MARYLAND

HISTORICAL MAGAZINE



ADVERTISEMENT OF WILLIAM GIST,
BALTIMORE MANUFACTURER OF PAINTS, 1824 (see p. 104)

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
BALTIMORE

March • 1966

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Activities

Provides library reference service to about 4,000 patrons yearly—scholars, writers, genealogists, students, collectors, artists. Mail and telephone inquiries double the figure.

Conducts lecture tours of its museum for an annual average of about 8,000 school students. Another 10,000 casual visitors, including tourists, view the collections, in addition to many museum students, collectors, hobbyists and authorities in given fields who utilize stored items for study.

Advises and assists 23 local historical societies in the counties, the work culminating in an Annual Conference of the Association of Maryland Historical Societies.

Maintains liaison with such allied groups as patriotic societies.

Acts as consultant to civic and governmental groups relative to publications and commemorative occasions.

Publishes the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, and *Maryland History Notes*. Circulation over 3,500 each.

Publishes scholarly works and low-cost school books and leaflets on Maryland history—over 50 different titles.

Holds meetings, open to the public, for lectures by authorities in various fields, including prominent government officials.

Stages special exhibits with timely themes.

* * *

For the Government of the State at cost

Edits, publishes and distributes the *Archives of Maryland*. 70th volume in preparation.

Conducts a program of marking historic sites with roadside signs.

Indexes important, original papers relating to Maryland history.

Preserves and publishes data pertaining to Maryland's contribution to World War II.

MSA SC 5881-1-241

MARYLAND
HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

PUBLISHED BY
THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY



VOLUME LXI

BALTIMORE

1966

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXI

	PAGE
HUNGER MENACES THE REVOLUTION, DECEMBER, 1779-JANUARY, 1780 <i>S. Sydney Bradford</i>	1
AN ORIGIN OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN MARYLAND: THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY, 1789-1826. <i>Richard W. Griffin</i>	24
THE IMPACT OF THE CIVIL WAR ON EDUCATION IN MARYLAND <i>Richard R. Duncan</i>	37
MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY ANNUAL REPORT FOR 1965	53
SIDELIGHTS	77, 167, 257, 348
REVIEWS OF RECENT BOOKS	81, 174, 262, 354
BOOKS RECEIVED FOR REVIEW	99, 184, 277, 365
NOTES AND QUERIES	101, 185, 278, 367
CONTRIBUTORS	104, 188, 282, 373
AND THE SHOW WENT ON . . . IN THE CONFEDERACY. <i>Sylvia G. L. Dannett</i>	105
FAILURE OF A MISSION: REVERDY JOHNSON IN LONDON, 1868-1869 <i>Adrian Cook</i>	120
THE LETTERBOOKS OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON, PISCATAWAY FACTOR <i>Edited by Richard K. MacMaster and David C. Skaggs</i>	146, 305
THE FAMILIAR LETTERS OF GOVERNOR HORATIO SHARPE <i>Edited by Aubrey C. Land</i>	189
FEDERALISM AT HIGH TIDE: THE ELECTION OF 1796 IN MARYLAND <i>Malcolm C. Clark</i>	210
MILITARY LAND BOUNTIES DURING THE REVOLUTIONARY AND CON- FEDERATION PERIODS. <i>Jean H. Vivian</i>	231
BACKGROUND FOR PLENTY: A NATIONAL CENTER FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH. <i>Vivian Wiser and Wayne D. Rasmussen</i>	283
BISHOP WHITTINGHAM, THE MARYLAND DIOCESE AND THE CIVIL WAR <i>Richard R. Duncan</i>	329

ILLUSTRATIONS

	PAGE	
Advertisement of William Gist, Baltimore Manufacturer of Paints, 1824	Cover,	March
Holliday Street Theater, <i>ca.</i> 1870 (1794-1917)	Cover,	June
Burning of the Front St. Theater & Circus, Feb. 3rd, 1839	betw.	118-119
Program, Holliday Street Theater, Wednesday, May 11, 1870	betw.	118-119
No. 1 Steam Fire Engine (1865). Courtesy The Peale Museum	Cover,	Sept.
Baltimore No. 7. Courtesy Baltimore Equitable Society, Early Fire-Fighting Museum	betw.	258-259
Baltimore No. 1. Early Fire-Fighting Museum	betw.	258-259
Benning Veterinary Station, Washington, D. C. <i>ca.</i> 1883. Courtesy Dept. of Agriculture	Cover,	Dec.
Beltsville Agricultural Research Station. Contemporary View. Courtesy Dept. of Agriculture	betw.	294-295
Walnut Grange, <i>ca.</i> 1805, Beltsville. The South wing was burned and not rebuilt. Today, the Residence of Super- intendent of Beltsville. Courtesy Charles A. Logan	betw.	294-295

MARYLAND HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

A Quarterly

Volume 61

MARCH, 1966

Number 1

HUNGER MENACES THE REVOLUTION, DECEMBER, 1779—JANUARY, 1780

By S. SYDNEY BRADFORD

No military engagement of the American Revolution endangered the Continental Army more than hunger did during December, 1779, and January, 1780. Only the genius of George Washington, the constancy of numerous officers and enlisted men, and the enforced cooperation of the people of the State of New Jersey prevented the dissolution of the army in the fourth winter of the Revolution.

Washington had decided by November 17, 1779, that the winter encampment for most of the Continental Army in the north would be near Morristown, New Jersey. He rode into that northern New Jersey village on Saturday, December 1.¹ Wind and snow escorted him and his party to the Jacob Ford

¹ Washington to Alexander McDougall, Nov. 17, and General Orders, Nov. 19, 1779, in John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Writings of George Washington* (39 vols.; Washington, D.C., 1931-44), XVII, 120, 137. Hereafter, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*.

house in the north part of town, where he established his headquarters.²

Atrocious weather helped to make the rest of December memorable. Rain followed the snow of December 1, and then it snowed on Wednesday, December 5. Rain fell again on December 14, and a heavy snowfall occurred on the 16th. Two days later, more snow arrived, and on December 28 another snowstorm filled the air. Additional snow swept in on the 29th, pursued by strong winds and more rain on the 30th. Unhappily, freezing temperatures fused with the storms, increasing their severity.³

Throughout December's chilling days, troops marched to Morristown. Brigadier General Edward Hand's Brigade, the New York Brigade, the 1st and 2nd Maryland Brigades, the 1st and 2nd Connecticut Brigades, the New Jersey Brigade, and Brigadier General John Stark's Brigade all reached the hilly encampment area, about three and a half miles southwest of Morristown, during the month. Those veteran units, plus Brigadier General Henry Knox's Artillery Brigade, which set up camp about a mile west of Morristown, comprised between ten and twelve thousand men. But the ending of enlistments, furloughs, and desertion reduced that total during the winter.⁴

Each infantry brigade, as soon as it located its specific camp site, began to construct its quarters. The brigade commanders supervised the work, following Washington's orders pertaining to the arrangement and the dimensions of the enlisted men's huts. As the soldiers toiled, they cleared the slopes of trees, erecting orderly groups of log houses where walnut, chestnut, and oak woods had stood.⁵ The enlisted men's huts apparently measured sixteen feet in front and back and fourteen feet on

² Sylvanus Seeley Diary, Dec. 1, 1779, Morristown National Historical Park, Morristown, N.J. (hereafter Seeley, Diary); Melvin J. Weig, *Morristown, A Military Capital of the American Revolution* (Washington, D.C., 1950), p. 12.

³ Seeley, Diary, Dec. 2, 5, 16, 19, 26, 29, 30, 1779; Ebenezer Parkman, Jr., Diary, Dec. 14, 16, 1779, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester, Mass. (hereafter Parkman, Diary); Nathan Beers Journal, Dec. 4, 16, 18, 28, 1779, Library of Congress (hereafter Beers, Jour., and L.C.).

⁴ Weig, *op. cit.*, p. 12; Douglas Southall Freeman, *George Washington* (7 vols.; New York, 1948-1957), V, 141-42, 150 (hereafter Freeman, *Washington*).

⁵ Washington to Nathanael Greene, Nov. 17, and General Orders, Nov. 19, Dec. 3, 1779, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 118-19, 137, 214-15; Weig, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

either side. Bunks for up to twelve men were placed on the interior walls, except where the fireplace and chimney stood. In addition to a front door, each hut was supposed to have a window, but the intense cold encouraged many soldiers to postpone making windows. Behind the enlisted men's quarters in each brigade camp sat the officers' huts, which varied in design and generally held from two to four men each.⁶

By December 31, most of the soldiers occupied huts, as did the officers who lived in camp.⁷ But the construction of the cabins had been an arduous task, made doubly difficult by the unrelentingly harsh weather.

Many of the troops had had to endure the rain and snow without complete uniforms.⁸ Those who had stumbled around barefooted suffered the most. Their misfortune so provoked Lieutenant Colonel Ebenezer Huntington, of the Connecticut Line, that on December 24 he exclaimed in a letter to a friend, "Poor fellows, my heart bleeds for them, while I Damn my country as void of gratitude."⁹

Harassed by the storms and hurt by the shortage of clothing, the Continentals had abided an even greater trial—hunger. They, almost alone of all Americans, did not have enough to eat in December, 1779. By New Year's eve, the army had received only half the regular allowance of bread for five or six weeks. Some soldiers on the 31st ate no bread at all.¹⁰

Washington, appalled by the condition of the army, had vented alarm over the army's hunger two weeks before December 31. On December 15, when he informed Brigadier General Anthony Wayne that the supply of flour in Morristown had almost been depleted, he also wrote to the President of the

⁶ S. S. Bradford, "Camp Buildings in Jockey Hollow, 1780," unpublished report, Morristown National Historical Park, fol. 6-9.

⁷ Weig, *op cit.*, p. 15.

⁸ Freeman, *Washington*, V, 141-42.

⁹ Huntington to Samuel Blachley Webb, Dec. 24, 1779, in Worthington C. Ford (ed.), *Correspondence and Journals of Samuel Blachley Webb* (3 vols.; New York, 1893), II, 231-32.

¹⁰ Washington to the President of Congress, Dec. 10, 1779, and to the Magistrates of New Jersey, Jan. 8, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 241-44, 362-65; Beers, *Jour.*, Dec. 31, 1779. Some Pennsylvania troops, while marching from West Point, New York to Morristown had had no bread for four days. William Irvine to Joseph Reed, Dec. 12, 1779, Joseph Reed Papers, New York Historical Society, N.Y.

Second Continental Congress, Samuel Huntington, that the army faced disaster because of the shortage of food. If the troops could not eat, the army would fall apart.¹¹

Motivated by the army's peril, Washington acted. In his letter of December 15 to Huntington, he urged that four or five thousand barrels of flour be borrowed from the amount collected for the French forces aiding the Americans. He believed that that could be done in Maryland, where, he had been informed, some 20,000 barrels had been gathered. "I know the measure recommended is a disagreeable one," he wrote, "but the motives of delicacy must often yield to those of necessity; and in the present case it appears to me to admit not of hesitation."¹²

The general himself had already sent away horses not absolutely needed in camp because of the shortage of forage. Realizing that the delivery of supplies depended on wagon teams, Washington, by December 10, had ordered the removal of as many horses as possible. Many of those animals thus spent the next several months in Pennsylvania.¹³

Even before receiving Washington's letter of December 15, Congress had endeavored to alleviate the situation in Morristown. In passing on December 11 a resolution concerning the procurement of supplies for the spring of 1780 from Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Delaware, Congress requested that Delaware deliver immediately its quota of 10,000 barrels of flour or wheat. Congress, in the same resolution, also entreated New Jersey to supply part of its quota of 8,000 barrels of flour as soon as possible. On the same day, the president of Congress wrote to Governor William Livingston, of New Jersey, emphasizing the appeal to New Jersey to begin to deliver flour. Huntington, moreover, referred to the earlier patriotic efforts of the state and said that he felt certain that New Jersey would exert herself now, for, as he wrote, ". . . it is needless for me to mention the fatal consequences that might ensue in this critical juncture of affairs should the army now in that State be without bread."¹⁴

¹¹ Washington to Anthony Wayne, Dec. 15, and to the President of Congress, Dec. 15, 1779, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 269-70, 272-73.

¹² *Ibid.*, 272-73.

¹³ Washington to the President of Congress, Dec. 10, 1779, *ibid.*, 241-44.

¹⁴ *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789* (34 vols.; Washington D.C.,

The distress at Morristown stemmed from several circumstances. Certain developments in the commissary general's office, responsible for the purchase of provisions, and the quartermaster general's office, responsible for the transportation of supplies, contributed to the crisis. Jeremiah Wadsworth, competent and hard-working, had resigned as the commissary general of purchases by December 20. Congress then elected Ephraim Blaine to fill the vacancy, and even though he soon undertook the duties of the office, he did not formally accept the position until January 12, 1780. Thus, at the very time the army began to starve, a basic change occurred in the office responsible for purchasing provisions.¹⁵ At about the same time, Major General Nathanael Green, the quartermaster general attempted to resign. That produced an unsettling effect in his office, even though Greene finally decided to retain his position.¹⁶

Causes other than difficulties in the commissary and quartermaster offices also lay behind the hunger at Morristown. Drought during the summer and fall of 1779 had damaged the crops. The scarcity of rain also had lowered streams, so much so that grist mills could not grind the corn and wheat delivered to them. Then the onslaught of a ferocious winter froze streams, again halting milling. The amazing December snows, furthermore, blocked roads, leaving them impassable for days.¹⁷

Nevertheless, the peoples' reluctance to sell their produce constituted the paramount reason for the army's misfortune.

1904-37), IV, 1371-72 (hereafter *Journals, Cont. Cong.*); and President of the Congress to the Governor of New Jersey, Dec. 11, 1779, in Edmund C. Burnett (ed.), *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* (8 vols.; Washington, 1921-36), XV, 1377 (hereafter Burnett, *Letters*).

¹⁵ *Journals, Cont. Cong.*, XV, 1343, 1349, XVI, 47; Roger Sherman to Jonathan Trumbull, Dec. 20, 1779, Burnett, *Letters*, IV, 541-42.

¹⁶ Sherman to Trumbull, *ibid.*, 541-42; Moore Furman to Clement Biddle, Dec. 20, 1779, in *The Letters of Moore Furman* (New York, 1912), 46-47 (hereafter *Letters, Furman*).

¹⁷ Jeremiah Wadsworth to Peter Colt, Nov. 26, 1779, Jeremiah Wadsworth Papers, Letterbook H, Conn. Historical Society, Hartford, Conn.; [Coxe] to [?], Dec. 10, 1779, General Sir Henry Clinton Papers, Clements Library, Ann Arbor, Michigan; George Clinton to William Heath, Dec. 4, 1779, in *Public Papers of George Clinton* (9 vols.; Albany, 1899-1911), V, 398-99; Moore Furman to Nathanael Greene, Dec. 8, 1779, Dreer Collection, Vol. II, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia (hereafter H.S.P.); Washington to the Magistrates of New Jersey, Jan 8, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 362-65.

The grain and cattle needed by Washington existed.¹⁸ But many farmers, dismayed by the rapid depreciation of the Continental dollar, refused to sell their produce for paper money, or demanded fantastic prices.¹⁹ Consequently, in New Jersey a commissary agent asservated that "... nothing but force will induce the farmers to thresh [;] they fear a Depreciation & regulation & think themselves most Secure with their property in hand—. . ."²⁰ In Pennsylvania, where grain was supposed to be scarce, it was reported that stills operated "at top speed."²¹

The reluctance of Americans to sell their produce, plus the difficulties engendered by nature, spurred Washington to circularize the governors of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland on December 16. "The situation of the army with respect to supplies," the commander in chief began, "is beyond description alarming." The soldiers, he continued, had lived on half their normal allowance of bread for almost a month and a half. Now, there was only enough bread to supply a third of the usual quota for the next three days. Never had the army faced such a dreadful situation concerning supplies, Washington declared. The magazines lay empty and the commissaries lacked the cash or credit to buy flour and meat. "Unless some extraordinary and immediate exertions are made by the States, from which we draw our supplies, there is every appearance that the army will infallibly disband in a fortnight," warned the general. The commander in chief closed by exhorting the governors to rush supplies in order to prevent the collapse of the army.²²

Washington's plea, reinforced by other reports of the army's precarious condition, prompted some of the states to redouble their efforts to aid it. New Jersey, which had already enacted numerous laws concerning provisions for the army, passed

¹⁸ Washington to Enoch Poor, Dec. 26, 1779, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 324-25; President of Congress to Jonathan Trumbull, Jan. 12, 1780, Burnett, *Letters*, V, 6; Nathanael Greene to Washington, Jan. [?], 1780, George Washington Papers, L. C.

¹⁹ Greene to Washington, Jan. [?], 1780, Washington Papers, L.C.; Thomas Burke to Joseph Reed, Dec. 22, 1779, Burnett, *Letters*, IV, 547-48.

²⁰ Azariah Dunham to Ephraim Blaine, Dec. 10, 1779, Ephraim Blaine Papers, L.C. (hereafter Blaine Papers, L.C.).

²¹ John Armstrong to James Searle, Burnett, *Letters*, IV, 537.

²² Circular to Governors of the Middle States, Dec. 16, 1779, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 273-74.

several new acts in response to the crisis. Perhaps the most important one was the act of December 25, 1779. It provided for a single superintendent of purchases for the state to oversee the purchase and distribution of food and forage, and for contractors in the various counties to do the actual buying. The legislature on December 25 also extended until April 1, 1780, a law prohibiting the hoarding of provisions.²³ Four days earlier, on December 21, the legislators had approved an act regulating the prices of supplies, which, after February 1, 1780, should not exceed "twenty Fold the Prices" of 1774. Unfortunately, the legislature also suspended that law on December 21, until New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware had enacted similar legislation.²⁴

Maryland responded even more decisively. Governor Thomas Sim Lee immediately enjoined the legislature to act, which it did, passing a law for the acquisition of supplies. That act provided for the appointment of commissioners in the several counties with the power to purchase or impress provisions. Furthermore, the legislature appealed to the state's citizens to deliver provisions to the commissioners. Maryland considered the crisis so dangerous, that the state placed the needs of the army above those of the French forces in America. Thus, flour already collected for the French was diverted to the American army, to the ire of French officials in the United States.²⁵ Far away in Morristown, Washington rejoiced at Maryland's actions. In writing to Governor Jonathan Trumbull, of Connecticut, on January 8, 1780, the general expressed the hope that other states would imitate Maryland's vigorous course.²⁶

Despite Washington's hope, no other state duplicated Maryland's actions. Delaware, beseeched by Congress on December 21 to expedite supplies to the army, legislated several ineffective

²³ Isaac S. Mulford, *A Civil and Political History of New Jersey* (Philadelphia, 1851), pp. 462-63; New Jersey, *Acts of the Council and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey* (Trenton, 1784), Ch. CLXXX, 114-17, Ch. CLXXI, 117.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, Ch. CLXXV, 104.

²⁵ Helen Lee Peabody, "Revolutionary Mailbag: Governor Thomas Sim Lee's Correspondence, 1779-1782," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XLIX (Mar., 1954), 7; Maryland, *Archives of Maryland. Journal and Correspondence of the State Council of Maryland, 1779-1780* (Baltimore, Md., 1924), XLIII, 44, 52 (hereafter Md., *Arch., Jour. and Corres. Council*); "Intelligence No. 1," Clinton Papers, Clements Library.

²⁶ Washington to Trumbull, Jan. 8, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 365-67.

steps apropos of the crisis. Among several laws passed by December 28 was one that prohibited the hoarding of provisions and one that prevented the export of supplies. On December 28, the Delaware assembly resolved that the state's president, Caesar Rodney, when requested by Congress or Washington, could hasten the despatch of supplies to Morristown.²⁷ Pennsylvania's president, Joseph Reed, informed Washington on December 22 that although provisions were not as plentiful in Pennsylvania as had been earlier thought, the Commonwealth would help. He expected the assembly to convene shortly.²⁸ New York and Connecticut might have been officially concerned about the distress at Morristown, but apparently took no immediate steps to aid the army.

While the preceding states responded to the emergency in various ways, the commissary and quartermaster offices strove to supply the army. But the lack of cash hamstrung their efforts.

Azariah Dunham, who became New Jersey's superintendent of purchases on December 25,²⁹ despatched numerous letters to the commissary general of purchases, Colonel Blaine, describing his attempts to procure provisions. He wrote from Morristown on December 10 and asserted that the dearth of cash had frustrated his endeavors to secure food. Now, as he affirmed in a postscript, there was "... no flour in the Magazine [;] what will be done I know not." Writing to Blaine from Trenton on December 16, the day of a tremendous snowstorm, the agitated commissary appealed for cash, requesting from \$80,000 to \$100,000. He disclosed, furthermore, that there was no flour in Trenton; and that he had had to pay £ 27 for a hogshead of rum for the army. Dunham, back at Morristown four days later, grumbled that the lack of cash had again forestalled the purchasing of supplies—in this instance, some cattle. He also noted "... [the] great complaint for flour from every quar-

²⁷ Resolution, Dec. 21, 1779, *Journals, Cont. Cong.*, XV, 1399; Samuel Huntington to Caesar Rodney, Dec. 21, 1779, in George H. Ryden, *Letters to and from Caesar Rodney, 1756-1784* (Philadelphia, 1933), pp. 331-32; Delaware, *Minutes of the Council of Delaware State, from 1776 to 1792* (Wilmington, 1887), pp. 510-11, 514.

²⁸ Joseph Reed to Washington, Dec. 22, 1779, Pennsylvania, *Pennsylvania Archives*, First Series (Philadelphia, 1853), VIII, 54-55.

²⁹ New Jersey, *Minutes and Proceedings of the Council and General Assembly of the State of New-Jersey, in Joint Meeting, from August 30, 1776 to May, 1780* (Trenton, 1780), 34.

ter. . . ." Blaine, in answering and urging Dunham to further exertion, concurred about the need for flour, asserting that "The want of bread in the army is a Melancholy circumstance. . . ." ³⁰

To Washington, the dearth of bread signalized more than just a "Melancholy circumstance." He knew that hunger in an army, like hunger in an individual, presaged collapse.irate, the commander in chief thrice summoned Charles Stewart, the commissary general of issues, to the Ford House in Morristown on December 22. Washington reproached the commissary about the army's plight. Where was the flour, the beef, and the pork? Without them, mutiny threatened. Balked in his attempt to feed the soldiers by the usual means, the general on the same day ordered the confiscation of provisions within a ten mile radius around the camp. ³¹

But the basic impasse remained. And Blaine's subordinates continued to bewail the shortage of cash. Robert Hoops wrote on December 25, "*Money—Money—Money—for gods sake [.] without it I can do little—send me what Cash you can. . . .*" Isaac Carty, another of Blaine's agents fretted from Wilmington, Delaware, on December 28 not only about the lack of money, but the fantastic prices demanded for provisions. Flour cost £ 75 per hundredweight, and wheat from £ 20 to \$60 a bushel. Moreover, speculators from Philadelphia had appeared. By offering outrageous prices for beef and wheat, those jackals had further forced up prices. Nevertheless, Carty asserted that ". . . their Shall be Nothing wanting in my part to Compleat the Supplys for the use of the Continantle Army if Suplyed with Cash, . . .", stating that he could spend £ 500,000 in a few "Weakes." ³² And even though Dunham on December 30 confidently expected the arrival of 10,000 bushels of grain, largely corn, he also reiterated the need for cash, writing, "I could purchase more if I had Cash but without it [it is like] making brick without straw." ³³

Like the commissary general, the quartermaster general ex-

³⁰ Dunham to Blaine, Dec. 10, 16, 20, 1779, and Blaine to Dunham, Dec. 22, 1779, Blaine Papers, L.C.

³¹ Charles Stewart to Blaine, Dec. 23, 1779, Blaine Papers, L.C.

³² Robert Hoops to Blaine, Dec. 25, 1779, and Isaac Carty to Blaine, Dec. 28, 1779, Blaine Papers, L.C.

³³ Dunham to Blaine, Dec. 30, 1779, Blaine Papers, L.C.

perienced great difficulty in carrying out the duties of his office. Greene, as well as his subordinates, seldom wrote a letter without deploring the obstacles encountered in trying to transport supplies and obtain forage.

Once again, money appeared to be the panacea. But it seemed to be nonexistent. Moore Furman, a deputy quartermaster general in Trenton, wrote throughout December to Greene, to associates in the department, and to creditors concerning the scarcity of cash.³⁴ Apropos of creditors, he emphasized his determination to promote their payment. Furman even informed one creditor that he would travel to Philadelphia to plead for cash before the proper boards.³⁵ Still, money remained in short supply. On January 6, 1780, Furman informed Greene that he could not meet the requests of his assistants for cash.³⁶ The quartermaster general, realizing the seriousness of the situation, bluntly announced to Washington that the people would not sell on credit and that provisions remained unobtainable, even though barns bulged with produce. Greene believed that "... the country is more plentifully stored with every material necessity for the provision and support of an army, than it has been for three years past."³⁷

The transportation of available supplies involved unending difficulties. Like cash, teams were scarce.³⁸ Moreover, when obtainable, they were expensive. A wagon master of a brigade of a four horse or ox team received \$180 a month. Wagon drivers earned £ 20 a day, plus receiving their meals and feed for their animals. Despite the good pay, the drivers stole from the provisions that they hauled. Their wagons frequently lumbered into Morristown with lighter loads than they had set out with.³⁹ The great snows, by blocking the roads, further

³⁴ Furman to Greene, Dec. 20, to John Mitchell, Dec. 21, to John I. Schank, Dec. 28, to Daniel Marsh, Dec. 31, 1779, *Letters, Furman*, pp. 45-46, 47-48, 48-49, 49-50.

³⁵ Furman to James Caldwell, Dec. 31, 1779, *ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

³⁶ Furman to Greene, Jan. 6, 1780, *ibid.* p. 54.

³⁷ Jared Sparks, *Correspondence of the American Revolution; Being Letters of Eminent Men to George Washington*. . . . (4 vols.; Boston, 1853), II, 371-74.

³⁸ Greene to Col. Hathaway, [Jan., 1780], Nathanael Greene Papers, Clements Library.

³⁹ Joseph Lewis to Samuel Day, Jan. 6, 1780, to Moore Furman, Dec. 25, 1779, and to James Gamble, Jan. 5, 1780, Joseph Lewis Letters, Park Collection, Morristown National Historical Park, Morristown, N.J. (hereafter Lewis Letters, M.N.H.P.). Also Furman to [?], Dec. 25, 1779, Park Coll., M.N.H.P.

compounded the difficulties of carrying provisions to Morristown. In one instance, Greene, after a particularly heavy snow in January, implored a colonel of the Morris County militia to employ his men and their teams to open the roads between Morristown and Hackettstown so that some provisions could be carried to camp.⁴⁰

The want of cash also contributed to the scarcity of forage. Although numerous horses had been sent away in order to conserve feed, the supply still dwindled. Washington's dismay at the soldiers' careless handling of forage, observed as he passed through camp late in December, led him to issue an order on Christmas Day forbidding the wastage of forage. He concluded the order by directing his brigade and regimental commanders to enforce it rigorously.⁴¹

Forty-eight hours prior to Christmas, Washington had had to impose a more unusual measure concerning forage. So destitute of food was the army, that the general instructed Colonel Clement Biddle to grind the Indian corn usually used as horse feed and to transport it to camp. There it would be meted out to the starving men. That expedient doomed a number of horses, but it succoured the troops.⁴²

Despite his efforts to relieve the situation Washington knew that the crisis worsened daily. He had informed Huntington on December 24 of the emptiness of the army's magazines and had stated that only strenuous efforts could fill them. Two days later, the commander in chief informed Brigadier General Enoch Poor, who commanded an outpost east of Morristown, that he regretted Poor's lack of supplies. Yet, he asserted, the situation in Morristown was more disheartening, the soldiers there existing on half allowance, and that only of rice. "It really appears hard that this should be the case," Washington averred, "when as you observe there is by no means a real scarcity of Grain. . . ." He also mentioned, for the first time, that he hoped that provisions would not have to be seized.⁴³

⁴⁰ Greene to Hathaway, [Jan., 1780], Greene Papers, Clements Library.

⁴¹ Almon W. Lauber, *Orderly Books of the Fourth New York Regiment, 1778-1780, the Second New York Regiment, 1780-1783* (Albany, 1932), 209.

⁴² Clement Biddle to Ephraim Blaine, Dec. 23, 1779, Blaine Papers, L.C., Washington to Biddle, Dec. 23, 1779, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 306.

⁴³ Washington to President of Congress, Dec. 24, 1779, and to Enoch Poor, Dec. 26, 1779, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 312, 324-25.

In Philadelphia, the Continental Congress fully understood the plight of the soldiers at Morristown. Letters by various members of Congress during the last two weeks of December discuss the shortage of supplies and the need for a stronger currency.⁴⁴ Additional gloomy information for the members to mull over arrived on January 3, 1780, when Jeremiah Wadsworth, in forwarding to Congress a copy of a letter he had sent to Washington, told the president that the army in New Jersey lacked fresh meat. Wadsworth ended his letter by stating that "... it is beyond a doubt with me that the army must soon look for food for themselves."⁴⁵

While Washington in the Ford House and the Continental Congress in Independence Hall worried about the condition of the Continental Army, the soldiers shivered and starved.

Snow cloaked the camp and an arctic chill cleaved the air on New Year's Day, 1780. New snow fell during the next day and night, ending on January 3. Strong winds followed, swirling the snow as gusts swept through the cheerless camp.⁴⁶

The snow and wind intensified the ache of hunger. An infantryman wrote in his diary on January 2 that no provisions had been issued for the past two days.⁴⁷ Another Continental noted on the same day, "... The Army at Morris Town exceeding short as to provisions."⁴⁸ Some men on January 3 drew half a pound of bread and the same quantity of beef, the allowance for January 2 and 3.⁴⁹ Three days later, a diarist observed, "... one days Beef, no Bread." He wrote on January 7, "... no provision in Camp. . . ."⁵⁰ During those days, one soldier gnawed birch bark when destitute of food for four days; some Continentals cooked their shoes and ate them; and several officers slew a pet dog and dined on him.⁵¹

⁴⁴ See, for example, William Floyd to the Governor of New York, Dec. 21, Thomas Burke to Joseph Reed, Dec. 22, Roger Sherman to the Governor of Connecticut, Dec. 28, 1779, Burnett, *Letters*, IV, 544, 547-48, 550.

⁴⁵ Jeremiah Wadsworth to [President of Congress], Jan. 3, 1780, Papers of Continental Congress, National Archives, Washington, D.C.

⁴⁶ Jan. 1-10, 1780, James Parker Diary, New Jersey Historical Society, Newark, N.J. See also Parkman, Diary, and Seely, Diary, for the same period.

⁴⁷ Beers, Jour., Jan. 2, 1780.

⁴⁸ Parkman, Diary, Jan. 2, 1780.

⁴⁹ Beers, Jour., Jan. 3, 1780.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, Jan. 6, 7, 1780.

⁵¹ Joseph Martin, *A Narrative of Some of the Adventures, Dangers, and Sufferings of a Revolutionary Soldier* (Hallowell, Me., 1830), pp. 124-25.

Lieutenant Colonel Ebenezer Huntington referred in a letter of January 6 to the crisis. He affirmed that "Our men bear it with that fortitude which becomes the Christian & Freeman—tho I am fearful, their resolution will not be Competent to the task, should the evil remain long."⁵² Huntington's foreboding about the continuation of the emergency had a basis, for the deplorable conditions had impaired discipline and morale.

Cold and hungry, the men stole from the countryside. They pilfered fence posts for fires and filched stock for food.⁵³ On December 20, Washington had denounced the plundering in a general order. He reported that the farmers near the camp had frequently complained about robbery, and he enjoined his officers to exert themselves to end the thievery. But fences and stock continued to vanish. And by January 5, Washington, through inaction, had sanctioned plundering. He wrote to the president of Congress on that day and stated that as his troops had endured such torment, ". . . I have it not in my power to punish or repress the practice [plundering]."⁵⁴

Two days before Washington had admitted his inability to restrain his soldiers, he had received a dismaying letter from Royal Flint, the assistant commissary of purchases at headquarters. Flint declared on January 3 that his earlier optimistic reports to Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Hamilton concerning supplies had not been borne out. Instead of having enough food to last until the middle of January, ". . . the Army is almost perishing for want." Meat had been exhausted. There was just enough bread for one more day.⁵⁵

With provisions depleted, Washington understood that the draconian punishment of marauding soldiers would not avert an even worse development among the unhappy brigades. On January 4, he contemplated ". . . a general forage upon the Country," in replying to Flint's letter. Agitated at the emptiness of the magazines, the commander in chief ordered Flint

⁵² Huntington to Samuel B. Webb, Jan. 6, 1780, Ford, *Corres. and Journals of Samuel Blachley Webb*, II, 240-41.

⁵³ S. Sydney Bradford, "Discipline in the Morristown Winter Encampments," *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society*, LXXX (Jan., 1962), pp. 15-16.

⁵⁴ General Orders, Dec. 20, 1779, and Washington to President of Congress, Jan. 5, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 331-32, 357-58.

⁵⁵ Flint to Washington, Jan. 3, 1780, Jonathan Trumbull Papers, Force Transcripts, L.C.

to inform him of what cattle and flour would be available in each county in New Jersey above and beyond what was already committed to the army. He also instructed Flint to give headquarters a week's notice before he expected an absolute deficiency of food.⁵⁶

Washington, on the same day, replied to a letter from Brigadier General William Irvine, who commanded an outpost at Crane's Mills, New Jersey, and had expressed alarm in his letter at the shortage of provisions in his area. Washington declared that the troops at Morristown suffered as much as Irvine's, and that no immediate aid was foreseen. Indeed, in the circumstances, he said, ". . . it is not easy to determine what course we should adopt."⁵⁷

But he did recommend a course of action to Irvine if his supplies should entirely fail—to impress food. After making a survey of the available cattle and grain in his area and deciding on what he needed and what the inhabitants could spare, Irvine should contact the local magistrates and have them apply an impressment. If they would not act (as private individuals, not in their official capacities), then he should enlist the aid of the most influential men who would cooperate. Once assessments had been levied on each family in a district, then parties should be dispatched to collect the provisions. Washington counselled Irvine that if an impressment had to be initiated ". . . every possible attention is to be paid to the privileges of citizens, and to obviate as much as in our power, those clamors, or feelings that may arise on the occasion." Collection parties should be led by "prudent and attentive" officers. Certificates, payable at present prices or when a general payment would be made, should be exchanged for all produce. He specifically directed that no milk cows should be seized and that all cattle taken should be weighed.⁵⁸

Washington, four days after writing to Irvine, decided to impress supplies for the troops at Morristown. On January 5, he not only informed Congress that he could not prevent men from

⁵⁶ Washington to Flint, Jan. 4, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 351-52.

⁵⁷ William Irvine to Washington, Jan. 4, 1780, Jonathan Trumbull Papers, Force Transcripts, L.C., and Washington to Irvine, Jan. 4, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 347-49.

⁵⁸ Washington to Irvine, *ibid.*

plundering, but that an intolerable dearth of provisions existed. He enclosed copies of Flint's and Irvine's letters to support his position, mentioning also that what supplies were available could not be brought in because of the drifted roads. Despite the surprising arrival of forty head of cattle during the previous night, he asserted that "If our condition should not undergo a very speedy and considerable change for the better, it will be difficult to point out all the consequences that might ensue." The next day Washington ordered his brigade commanders to discharge all men whose enlistments expired on January 31. But that expedient came too late to be of decisive help. Thus, on January 8 Washington apprised the governor of Connecticut that he had been forced to effect a general impressment in New Jersey.⁵⁹

Washington, also on January 8, informed the magistrates of New Jersey counties of the impressment. He opened his letter by saying that since the start of the Revolution the soldiers had never experienced such starvation. For the past fourteen days they frequently had lacked meat or bread. "They have borne their sufferings with a patience that merits the approbation and ought to excite the sympathy of their Countrymen." So mortal has the soldiers' distress been, Washington continued, that they have been impelled to maraud. Ordinarily, plunderers would have been punished with "exemplary severity." Now, the marauding can ". . . only be lamented as the effect of an unfortunate necessity." The first paragraph's termination warned that only an immediate remedy could avert a worse "evil."⁶⁰

After describing the menace to the army, Washington explained the origin of the crisis and offered a solution to it. He blamed the unusually severe winter and the consequent blocking of the roads for the army's predicament, tactfully saying nothing about the plenitude of provisions and the peoples' reluctance to sell food and forage. With magazines empty and little hope that effective aid could come from the other states within less than five weeks, he stressed that only an unusual

⁵⁹ Washington to President of Congress, Jan. 5, 1780, to Brigadiers and Officers Commanding Brigades, Jan. 6, and to Jonathan Trumbull, Jan. 8, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 357-58, 358, 365-67.

⁶⁰ Washington to the Magistrates of New Jersey, Jan. 8, 1780, *ibid.*, 362-65.

effort within New Jersey could avert the "fatal consequences [that] must unavoidably ensue." "Your own discernment," Washington said, "makes it needless to particularise."⁶¹

"Influenced by these considerations, my duty to the Public and my affection to the virtuous Inhabitants of this State. . . .", he had decided on an impressment, he wrote in the beginning of the third paragraph. Washington then summoned the various counties to provide provisions to assuage the needs of the army. He specified a quota of so many bushels of grain and so many head of cattle for each county, which quotas should be ready in a certain number of days after receipt of his letter.

In the fourth and fifth paragraphs, Washington outlined the method for the application of the impressment. As the magistrates, he said, must be acquainted with the situation in their respective counties, they could determine the amounts to be assessed for individuals. Furthermore, he continued, ". . . I am persuaded your zeal for the common cause will induce you to exert your utmost influence to procure a cheerful and immediate compliance." When the commodities had been collected, a commissary would give certificates for all the provisions. And, as Washington had directed in writing to Irvine on January 4, the citizens could opt for payment at the then market price or at the market price when payment would be made. Moreover, any two magistrates, plus the commissary, would estimate the weight of the cattle.

Washington praised and threatened in concluding the letter. He told the magistrates that he knew that they would exert themselves "to give efficacy to this requisition," and that the loyal people of New Jersey would cooperate with them. Nevertheless, should the impressment fail, he asserted that ". . . I think it my duty to inform you, that should we be disappointed in our hopes, the extremity of the case will compel us to have recourse to a different mode, which will be disagreeable to me on every account, on none more than on the probability of its having an operation less equal and less convenient to the Inhabitants, than the one now recommended." Finally, he assured the magistrates that he had related an honest description of the

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

situation. Therefore, ". . . delay or indecision is incompatible with our circumstances."⁶²

The commander in chief also wrote on January 8 to the officers selected to supervise the impressment. These instructions opened tersely by explaining the necessity to raise provisions. If the requisition failed, then, as the magistrates had been told, provisions would be seized.

The next three paragraphs consist of directions for enforcing the impressment. A quota had been established for each county. Bergen County, for example, had to raise 800 bushels of grain and 200 head of cattle. When the officers had reached their various counties, they were to deliver the "address" to the magistrates, plus presenting an oral description of the dire state of the army, ". . . the better to convince them of the necessity of their exertions." Moreover, the officers should inform the magistrates, "delicately," that if they would not speedily apply the requisition, an immediate confiscation of provisions would occur. If the magistrates agreed to Washington's request, a place for the delivery of the provisions was to be set. The supplies were to be delivered four days after the magistrates had received the "address." When the provisions had arrived, the grain was to be measured and the cattle weighed, the weight of the stock being estimated by two of the magistrates and the commissary. As in the letter to the magistrates, Washington stated that the people would receive certificates respecting the provisions handed over, which certificates would indicate how the holders wished to be paid when the general payment would be made, at the market price at the time of delivery or at the market price at the time of payment. The reactions of the various magistrates upon receiving the "address" and oral explanation were to be relayed immediately to Washington.⁶³

Should the magistrates of any county refuse to accede to the letter from Washington, then the officer responsible for the county should confiscate provisions. If that undesirable course became necessary, the impress was to be effected ". . . with as much tenderness as possible to the Inhabitants." No milk cows

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ Washington to Officers to Collect Provisions, Jan. 8, 1780, *ibid.*, 360-62.

were to be taken and no family was to be completely stripped, leaving it without food.⁶⁴

Washington's respect for the rights of the people appears in both the "address" and the letter to the officers. Even in this crisis, the commander in chief displayed a unique regard for the basic principle for which he and the army fought, individual rights. The last paragraph but one in the officers' instructions underscores that.

I have reposed this trust in you from a perfect confidence in your prudence, zeal and respect for the rights of Citizens. While your measures are adapted to the emergency, and you will consult what you owe to the service, I am persuaded you will not forget, that, as we are compelled by necessity to take the property of Citizens for the support of the Army on whom their safety depends, we should be careful to manifest that we have a reverence for their rights, and wish not to do anything which that necessity and even their own good do not absolutely require.⁶⁵

Washington had resorted to the requisition without informing the Continental Congress. Although he had mentioned the possibility of a requisition or impressment to several officers prior to January 8, he had not alerted Congress to that possibility. Even in his letter on January 5, which concluded apologetically and tactfully by saying, "It gives me extreme pain that I should still be holding up to Congress our wants on the score of provisions; . . .", he did not intimate that he contemplated a requisition. He did assert that an immediate improvement in the matter of provisions was necessary in order to avert further deterioration in the army, but did not suggest any means of bringing about that improvement.⁶⁶

But as Washington had considered a requisition to ease the immediate plight of the army, he had also sought to stimulate Congress to act to help guarantee the safety of the army after the current emergency had been ended. He attached to his letter of January 5 to Congress copies of Royal Flint's and Brigadier General William Irvine's letters of January 3 and 4 respectively. Upon reaching Philadelphia, the three letters were referred to a committee, which reacted to Washington's com-

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Washington to President of Congress, Jan. 5, 1780, *ibid.*, 357-58.

munication on Wednesday, January 12. The committee resolved that copies of the letters, ". . . as far as they respect the distress of the army from the want of provisions, . . .", be sent to the governments of Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, ". . . and that they be respectively urged, in the most pressing manner, to send immediate supplies of provisions to the army." On the same day, the president of Congress complied with the resolution and wrote to the four governors concerned, strongly urging that aid be hastened to the army. He warned that unless those states acted with dispatch, the army might disband, for although "The Country abounds with the necessary Resources, . . . private gain seems the only Object of too many Individuals without any Concern for the Public Safety."⁶⁷

The reaction of the states to the crisis varied. Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware indicated compliance with the Congressional resolution, but like heavily loaded, lurching wagons on a snow covered road, moved slowly. Maryland, on the other hand, like a fast moving chaise on a dry road, smartly continued her efforts to help Washington.

Maryland had not been included in the Congressional resolution of January 12, perhaps because Congress realized the state's earnestness in attempting to help the army. Pursuing the course adopted late in December, 1779, Maryland now authorized the seizure of grain. The Council in Annapolis instructed the commissioners of Cecil County on January 17, 1780, to confiscate wheat that had been purchased under the pretext that it was for the use of the French army and navy. That nefarious practice, according to the Council, had contributed to the shortage of wheat. On the following day, the Council expressed its anger in a letter to the commissioners for "Baltimore Town" at the reluctance of the town's citizens to support the army. Again, the members of the Council directed that flour held under the guise that it was for the French should be seized. The Council also declared that the commissioners were empowered to enter any place where grain or flour was stored. The state's decisiveness upset the Chevalier De La Luzerne, France's minister to the United States, because

⁶⁷ *Journals, Cont. Cong.*, XVI, 46; President of Congress to Governor of Connecticut, Jan. 12, 1780, Burnett, *Letters*, V, 6.

on January 19 the Council wrote to Luzerne and explained why wheat and flour for the French forces had been seized in Maryland. Once the emergency had passed, the Council informed Luzerne, flour would be made available to the French.⁶⁸

While the army impressed supplies in New Jersey, no improvement occurred concerning prices and the supply of money. Prices remained high. Some citizens near the camp at Morristown took advantage of the crisis and charged exorbitant prices for articles sold to the soldiers. An ear of corn sold for fifty cents and a quart of meal for \$8.00. Even worse, a quart of rum, as late as February 5, cost from \$40 to \$50 at the camp.⁶⁹ Elsewhere, prices also remained high. A convention of states at Philadelphia at the end of January to fix prices failed to reach a satisfactory agreement. Indeed, by February 17, a member of the New Jersey delegation to the Continental Congress declared that in the market a paper dollar was worth only a penny, and that a dollar would probably soon be worth less than half a penny.⁷⁰

Money, as in the past, remained in short supply. Throughout January, members of the commissary and quartermaster offices repeatedly complained about the lack of money. Azariah Dunham wrote to the chief of the commissary department on January 13, saying in part, ". . . [I] am so exhausted of money that [I] can scarcely bear my expenses [:] the complaints of those who have purchased for me is prodigious and our debt is Amazingly increased since I saw you. . . ." He also lamented that his credit had almost been destroyed.⁷¹ Thirteen days later, on January 26, a deputy quartermaster general in New Jersey wrote that although some forage had been collected, ". . . the Public is many Months & Millions of Dollars in arrears to the Citizens of this State, who now begin to Groan aloud under the Burdens and I am exceedingly alarmed now and under great anxiety lest it will not remain long in my Power, to

⁶⁸ Council to the Commissioners of Cecil County, Jan. 17, to the Commissioners for Baltimore Town, Jan. 18, and to His Excellency The Chevalier De La Luzerne, Jan. 19, 1780, Md., *Arch., Jour. and Corres. Council*, XLIII, 66-68.

⁶⁹ Oliver Ellsworth to Jonathan Trumbull, Jan. 14, 1780, Burnett, *Letters*, V, 9; Captain [?] Doughty to Major Sebastian Bauman, Feb. 5, 1780, Sebastian Bauman Papers, New York Historical Society, New York.

⁷⁰ William G. Sumner, *The Financier and the Finances of the American Revolution* (2 vols.; New York, 1891), I, 84; Abraham Clark to Caleb Camp, Feb. 17, 1780, Burnett, *Letters*, V, 40-41.

⁷¹ Dunham to Blaine, Jan. 13, 1780, Blaine Papers, L.C.

perform the Task set me under my present Circumstances. . ."⁷²

Despite the continuing exigency about prices and money, the requisition accomplished its purpose—to save the army. Fortunately, good weather existed from January 9 until the end of the month. Although cold, little or no additional snow fell to impede the transportation of provisions to Morristown.⁷³

Washington had called upon the various counties in New Jersey to supply a total of 2,200 head of cattle and 12,150 bushels of grain in order to ease the army's immediate predicament.⁷⁴ Both the magistrates and the people of the counties responded quickly. So much so, that special parties sent from camp on January 8 to borrow provisions in Morris County, or seize them if need be, could be ordered in on January 11.⁷⁵

Some problems arose in several of the counties during the requisition. Washington, grateful for the general compliance, resolved them in favor of the people. As early as January 10, two days after the inauguration of the requisition, Washington instructed Colonel Mathias Ogden, who supervised the requisition in Essex County, to accept a reasonable additional quantity of grain in place of the full quota of cattle, which it appeared could not be met, ". . . it being my wish not [to] distress the Inhabitants more than our circumstances unavoidably require."⁷⁶ When Colonel Richard Butler, in charge of Hunterdon County, wrote to Washington on January 21 and stated that the county could meet its quota of 150 cattle only by giving up some working oxen, Washington replied on January 24 that would not be necessary, as a good amount of provisions was on hand. Thus, ". . . I would not wish you to distress any of the Inhabitants by taking their working Oxen."⁷⁷ Two days later Washington agreed with Lieutenant Colonel William

⁷² Furman to Charles Petit, Jan. 26, 1780, *Letters, Furman*, 54-56.

⁷³ Sceley, Diary, Jan. 9-30, 1780; James Parker Diary, New Jersey Historical Society, Jan. 16, 20-31, 1780.

⁷⁴ Washington to the Magistrates of New Jersey, Jan. 8, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 362-65.

⁷⁵ Richard Butler to Washington, Jan. 21, and Isaac Sherman to Washington, Jan. 26, 1780, Washington Papers, Vol. 126, L.C.; Brigade Orders, Jan. 8, 1780, Orderly Book, 2 New York Regiment, Nov. 15, 1779 to June 23, 1780, New York Hist. Soc.; General Orders, Jan. 11, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 378.

⁷⁶ Washington to Mathias Ogden, Jan. 10, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 371-72.

⁷⁷ Richard Butler to Washington, Jan. 21, 1780, Washington Papers, Vol. 126, L.C.; Washington to Butler, Jan. 24, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 439.

DeHart's suggestion that Bergen County supply more than its quota of 1,200 bushels of grain in order to make up for a deficiency in the number of cattle required, 200. Also on January 26, the commander in chief agreed that Middlesex County could make up a deficiency in cattle by supplying grain in excess of its quota of 600 bushels.⁷⁸

The success of the requisition is emphasized by Washington's about face concerning plundering. The magistrates of Morris County informed Washington on January 25 that they had recognized the necessity of abiding plundering and insulting behavior by some soldiers during the crisis, but now that the emergency was over, they could not understand the continued criminal actions of some of the troops. Certainly, they believed, punishment of plundering could now be enforced.⁷⁹ On January 27 Washington responded to that complaint. He expressed appreciation for the aid of the people and declared that he intended to protect their persons and property. Unlike his statement of January 5, which said that he could not prevent marauding, he now affirmed that if ". . . Offenders . . . can be pointed out by the Inhabitants, [they] shall be subjected to the most condign punishment." The next day the commander in chief issued a general order in which he condemned plundering and insulting behavior. Both were ". . . intolerable, and a Disgrace to the Army. . . ." Furthermore, if henceforth any soldiers should be found outside of camp after retreat, the officer of the guard ". . . is authorized and required to give them One Hundred Lashes upon the Spot;" and ". . . if any are found perpetrating Robbery, or other Violence, they are to receive from One to Five Hundred Lashes, at the Discretion of the Officer."⁸⁰ The very next day, Private Jack Miller, 4 New York Regiment, received one hundred lashes at evening roll call for having stolen some mutton.⁸¹

⁷⁸ William De Hart to Washington, Jan. 24, 1780, Washington Papers, Vol. 126, L.C.; Washington to De Hart, Jan. 26, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 447; and Isaac Sherman to Washington, Jan. 26, 1780, Washington Papers, Vol. 126, L.C.; Washington to Sherman, Jan. 26, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 448.

⁷⁹ The Justices of Morris County to Washington, Jan. 25, 1780, Washington Papers, Vol. 126, L.C.

⁸⁰ Washington to the Justices of Morris County, Jan. 27, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 542; General Orders, Jan. 28, 1780, Orderly Book, Hawkins' Orderly Book, Jan. 1-June 26, 1780, H.S.P.

⁸¹ Bradford, "Discipline at Morristown," *Proc. N.J. Hist. Soc.*, p. 17.

On January 27, the day before issuing his general order about plundering, Washington had for the first time officially informed the Continental Congress of the requisition. Although sufficient provisions were now on hand, he had been forced to ". . . call upon the Magistrates in every County in the State for specific quantities to be supplied in a limited number of days." Because the counties had responded so rapidly, ". . . the Army in a great measure has been kept together." Congress subsequently expressed gratification at the patriotism of New Jersey's citizens, passing a resolution to that effect on January 31.⁸²

Washington also expressed his thanks to the people of New Jersey. He wrote to the various magistrates on February 2, thanking them and their fellow citizens for their support of the army. "You," he wrote, "have given a striking proof of your attachment to the service, of your regard to the accommodation of the army, and an earnest of what may be expected in every future exigence. It is however to be hoped a similar occasion may not again occur."⁸³

The commander in chief's hinting of a similar crisis in the future while thanking the magistrates and people of New Jersey would not have surprised those who knew Washington. On January 8, the day he had undertaken the requisition, Washington had observed in his letter to Governor Trumbull that his action must be regarded as ". . . an expedient as temporary in its relief as it is disagreeable in its exertion, and injurious in its tendency. An Army is not to be supported by measures of this kind. Something of a more permanent and effectual nature must be done."⁸⁴ After the requisition had succeeded, the general realized that nothing fundamental had been accomplished.

⁸² Washington to President of Congress, Jan. 27, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 449-50; Resolution, Jan. 31, *Journals, Cont. Cong.*, XVI, 111.

⁸³ Washington to the Magistrates of New Jersey, Feb., 2, 1780, Fitzpatrick, *Writings*, XVII, 481.

⁸⁴ Washington to Trumbull, Jan. 8, 1780, *ibid.*, 365-67.

AN ORIGIN OF THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN MARYLAND: THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY, 1789-1826

By RICHARD W. GRIFFIN

MARYLAND, as other states, was economically depressed as a result of post-war problems incident to the gaining of American independence. Nearly a century and a half of tobacco production had reduced the fertility of its soil and the loss of the British monopoly for the crop forced many residents to seek new business activities for the profitable employment of capital. Baltimore, a port of growing importance, offered commercial opportunities as one outlet for investment, but American trade was at a standstill until treaties could be negotiated. However, released as the new states were from the manufacturing restrictions of Great Britain, there was a slowly developing interest in manufacturing and particularly in textiles which could be in part built on the long established household production of the colonial period. During the Revolutionary War there may have been in Maryland some small steps toward a transition from domestic to the factory system, stimulated by a shortage of cloth and clothing due to the blockade.

During the 1780's there was an influx of skilled artisans from Europe in all the new states who offered to establish manufacturing for their own profit and to bring to their adoptive state economic independence as a bulwark to political freedom. Consequently with trained persons available there was a greater chance for success in the establishment of a factory in Maryland. The immediate problem was a satisfactory supply of a fibre—wool was more readily available than others, but long staple cotton could at high expense be imported from the West Indies. Thomas Jefferson, as the American representative in Paris, recommended to one French entrepreneur that if he wished to make woolen goods that Maryland was a good location.¹

¹ A. A. Lipscomb and A. L. Bergh, *The Writings of Jefferson*, 20 vols. (Washington, 1903), V, 132, Thomas Jefferson to Gillis de Lavallee, September 11, 1785.

In late 1788 and in 1789 a group of Baltimore residents attempted to organize a cotton manufacturing firm.² They were able to promote sufficient interest in the project to get enough capital subscribed to organize a company. In 1791 the stockholders were called to a meeting which may have portended the concern's abandonment,³ for there were no subsequent references to this company.

A letter of a Maryland citizen, who wanted to see an increase of manufacturing activity, pointed out that there were many advantages for factories in the state—plentiful and cheap food for workers, raw materials, and low taxes. He noted that the chief argument against local manufacturing was the scarcity of labor and consequent high wages that artisans could demand. In his opinion he said that “it seems odd, that a country requiring manufactures, and able to pay for them, should not be a fit country for manufacturing.”⁴

The editor of the *Maryland Gazette* kept his readers informed of a small textile mill rising on the Indian frontier near Nashville in the Territory South of Ohio.⁵ It was obvious to him that if such an undertaking was possible in this isolated area there was no reason why factories could not be successful in Maryland. In the late fall of 1792 he published two articles which urged his fellow citizens to profit from the advantages created by the outbreak of the French Revolutionary War to start factories.⁶ However, the commercial and agricultural revival which this war stimulated drew all interest away from manufacturing ventures. The profits available in these other activities made new ones unnecessary and their speculative character more suspect. Conditions were not yet ripe for prospective industrial entrepreneurs to turn to manufacturing. The fifteen years from 1792 until 1807 produced several important changes in the state which made textile fabrication easier to undertake—Whitney's perfection of the cotton gin; Samuel Slater's successful introduction of cotton manufacturing into Rhode Island; the launch-

² *Maryland Journal* (Baltimore), April 25, 1789.

³ *Ibid.*, April 1, 1791.

⁴ *Virginia Gazette* (Alexandria), February 19, 1790, quoting a letter of a Maryland resident, January 18, 1790.

⁵ *Maryland Gazette* (Annapolis), April 5, 1792; July 10, 1793.

⁶ *Ibid.*, November 29, December 6, 1792.

ing of several cotton mills in other southern states; and an accumulation of surplus capital through wartime profits.

By 1807 the weaknesses of an under-industrialized nation were becoming more apparent—and especially the disadvantages of a raw material producing type of colonial economy dependent upon the caprice of European statesmen. The Peace of Amiens gave to observant Americans a foretaste of what permanent European peace would mean to the American merchant and farmer—a relapse into that economic chaos that characterized the years from 1783 to 1792. Thus when the *Chesapeake-Leopard* Affair occurred in 1807 and was followed swiftly by Jefferson's embargo program the need for self-sufficiency for America became plentifully evident.

As is so frequently the case the promoters of the first successful textile mill in the state were individuals already closely associated with Maryland's economic advance. Late in 1807 a group of Baltimore citizens led by William Patterson, who was then president of the Bank of Maryland, began consideration of a plan to build a cotton mill to take advantage of the abrupt interdict on the importation of foreign products. Late in the year they held informal meetings which led to the holding of a public meeting of those residents who were interested in helping establish a cotton and woolen mill in the city. The first of several meetings was held at the Merchant's Coffee House on the evening of January 2, 1808.

At this session a special committee was selected to investigate carefully the problems to be overcome before such an enterprise could be started in Baltimore. William Patterson, chairman of this select committee, called upon its members to meet at the Coffee House on January 6th to receive any special information relative to the proposed factory from any resident who had experience with such an enterprise. The information thus gathered was to provide the basis for giving wider information to the public.⁷ The editor of the *American* reported that the first meeting had attracted the enthusiastic support of the city's leading merchants. The conclusion of those in attendance was that the city could vie successfully with "any of the manufacturing

⁷ *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D. C.), January 8, 1808, quoting a Baltimore report of January 2, 1808.

towns of Great Britain," if tariff protection were provided by Congress and the water power potential of Jones' Falls were properly developed. The editor claimed that

everything that tends to throw light on this sure road to wealth will no doubt be communicated to the public by every patriotic citizen, who feels a concern for the welfare of his country, and in the commencement of manufacturing establishments in the city, we have no doubt that everyone engaged therein will be amply rewarded, besides the pleasure he will enjoy of having given support to characters who would otherwise have been thrown on the mercy of the public for want of employ in consequence of the existence of the present state of things.⁸

The successful conference led the Baltimore industrial entrepreneurs to proceed with their plans for the organization of the Union Manufacturing Company of Maryland. These activities in Maryland had their counterpart in every state from Maine to the Territory of Mississippi. The interest in and expansion of manufacturing were given widespread publicity by editors everywhere—as a means to stimulate prosperity, to gain independence, to create badly needed employment, to establish local markets for the staple and food crops for farmers, and to develop new sources of productive wealth for the nation. In praising the Baltimore promoters a local editor urged Congress to raise the tariff on textile goods by eighteen or twenty percent. This he said would assure prospective investors of protection for such enterprises from European competition when the Embargo Act was repealed—"let then the protection of manufactures and navigation be the order of the day."⁹

The organizers of the Union Manufacturing Company were able to unite the concern's supporters and began the sale of stock late in February, 1808. They aimed at raising the huge sum of one million dollars through the sale of 20,000 shares of stock at fifty dollars a share. The price of the shares was kept small to draw in small investors and thus more effectively mobilize available capital. The articles of association limited the amount of investment of any one individual to 500 shares—which was no serious limitation. The subscribers were required

⁸ Baltimore (Md.) *American*, January 4, 1808.

⁹ *Republican* (Savannah, Ga.), February 11, 1808, quoting a Baltimore newspaper.

to pay down at the time of subscription \$2.50 on each share purchased.¹⁰ Numerous agents of the company offered shares for sale in the larger towns of Maryland and in the District of Columbia. They secured subscriptions for 5,000 shares valued at \$250,000 on the first day of sale in Baltimore alone. This strong support for the scheme led to the immediate permanent organization of the firm and to plans for construction of the mill.¹¹

By special request, or so it was reported by commissioners of the company, the books of subscription were reopened in April for the benefit of those who had not had a chance to buy stock earlier. John Gill, one of the officers, was authorized to take further orders for stock for one week at his office.¹² The stockholders were then called together to proceed with the election of permanent officers, and John McKim, wealthy merchant, was elected president of the Union Company. The directors then called for the payment of another installment of \$2.50 per share to be paid at the Bank of Maryland on or before May 6, 1808.¹³

Samuel H. Smith, editor of the *National Intelligencer*, which was the voice of the Jefferson administration, published a long article urging further investment in manufacturing and pointed out the establishment of mills in Maryland, Virginia, and in the capital itself. He noted the efforts of three textile companies in Baltimore, Richmond, and Petersburg, to raise over a million and a half dollars for industrial purposes. This was not only important news but served to attract other entrepreneurs into textile manufacturing.¹⁴

While Baltimore capitalists proceeded with their building program another smaller textile factory was being built in the interior of Maryland. E. Gibbs, a skilled machinist with textile experience, built and sold fourteen wool and cotton carding machines in the neighborhood of Hagerstown. In addition he built in the town a small spinning mill which operated 300 spindles in making yarn for local home weavers to manufacture.

¹⁰ *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D. C.), March 4, 1808.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, March 11, 1808; *Republican* (Savannah, Ga.), March 31, 1808.

¹² Baltimore (Md.) *Evening Post*, April 2, 1808. Gill's office was located at 48 Water Street.

¹³ *Ibid.*, April 21, 1808.

¹⁴ *City Gazette* (Charleston, S. C.), June 1, 1808, quoting the *National Intelligencer*; *National Intelligencer*, June 27, 1808.

In the fall of 1809 Gibbs built and added to his plant mule spinning frames to increase his production. The demand for cloth led several of the local weavers to install flying-shuttles which enabled them to increase cloth making and to better supply the needs of western Maryland. A local resident reported that the cloth lacked much in fineness, but "there appears to be a general preference among our citizens for domestic products, which although not so superb and gaudy as the enervated European might think stylish, yet they are comfortable and suitable to republican manners."¹⁵

In 1808 the Maryland legislature issued the first corporate charter for a textile plant to the Union Manufacturing Company of Maryland. The next year John Davis, John Hagerty, Moses Hand, William Edwards, and Isaac Burniston were incorporated as the Washington Cotton Manufacturing Company of Baltimore, which was empowered to raise \$50,000 and build its mill at Jones' Falls.¹⁶ In 1809 and 1810 Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, took a special census of manufacturing of the United States—and of all the slave states Maryland had made the most progress. In 1809 there were in Baltimore two textile mills operating 1,100 spindles which were increased in 1810 to 6,000; a third mill which was to have 5,000 spindles was being built in 1810; and there was a small mill in Washington County with 300 spindles and another in Patuxent with 300 spindles. In 1808 there were 1,400 spindles in three Maryland factories and, in 1810, five mills had 11,600.¹⁷ The census in 1810 reported a total of eleven cotton and woolen mills in the state.¹⁸

By 1810 the 2,000 members of the Maryland Association for the Encouragement of Domestic Manufactures agreed to wear no foreign made cloth when a satisfactory local substitute was available. A special committee, appointed by John D. Craig, secretary of the general association, began an investigation of the development of manufactories in and around Baltimore. In the area were three large cotton mills as well as calico print-

¹⁵ *Maryland Gazette* (Annapolis), October 18, 1809; *National Intelligencer*, November 17, 1809.

¹⁶ *Maryland Session Laws* (Annapolis, 1810), Act 163.

¹⁷ *City Gazette* (Charleston, S. C.), May 21, 1810, quoting Gallatin's report.

¹⁸ *Niles' Register*, VII (July 9, 1814), 323.

ing and dyeing mill which was a further indication of the progress being made toward complex textile production. The first mill to complete its entire plant was the Washington Cotton Company—its owners invested \$80,000 in building a factory at Jones' Falls, where they operated 1,000 spindles in the manufacture of 2,000 hanks of yarn each week. They produced several qualities of yarn—from a coarse No. 8 to their finest which was No. 30, and in addition they operated seven power looms in the manufacture of cords, twills, stripes, chambrays, gingham, sheeting, and shirting. The mill had its own dye house to produce the colored thread needed in making their several specialty cloths.¹⁹ In 1823 the company had a warehouse at 2 South Charles Street in Baltimore where they sold their products directly to the public. The company, whose chief officers were John Kelso, president, and John H. Baker, treasurer, had by then given up weaving and produced only yarns.²⁰

The Union Manufacturing Company of Maryland, the oldest of the state's textile mills, began building its works on the Patapsco River in 1808. This concern built two large mills and soon had the smaller of the two in operation with 800 spindles, while by 1810 the larger of the mills—to house 6,000 to 8,000 spindles—was nearly completed. This company was equipped with machinery made in its own machine shops—spinning frames as well as power looms. In this manner one of the most complete textile establishments in the south was locally built. The company employed a staff of skilled workmen to keep their equipment in repair and to build new machinery as it was needed.²¹ In 1815 the largest of the Union Company's mills was accidentally destroyed by fire at a loss of \$70,000 and threw 200 employees out of work.²²

The smaller of the factories continued to operate while the company rebuilt the other mill building. The company sold its yarns throughout Maryland and Virginia—in the summer of 1817 a regular outlet was established with the firm of Anderson

¹⁹ *City Gazette* (Charleston, S. C.), June 18, 1810; *Virginia Argus* (Richmond), June 29, 1810, each quoting the report of the Maryland Association.

²⁰ *Commercial Directory* (Philadelphia, 1823), 77.

²¹ *Star* (Raleigh, N. C.), June 21, 1810; *Enquirer* (Richmond, Va.), June 26, 1810.

²² *Niles' Register*, X (December 23, 1815), 298.

& Dabney in Richmond who claimed in their advertisements that "those yarns have long and deservedly ranked with the best in the country."²³ In 1819 William A. Knox offered his Fredericksburg customers the yarns of the Union Company at Baltimore prices.²⁴ The Union factory management had collected \$450,000 by 1823 from its stockholders for investment in the extensive textile plants it owned.²⁵

In 1809 John and E. Levering invested \$200,000 in the construction of the Powhatan Cotton Factory at Gwynn's Falls. Their mill was built to accommodate 5,000 spindles and a number of looms for the manufacture of finer goods—corduroy, velvet, and thickets. The owners brought workmen to Baltimore who were especially trained in the production of these goods. The Powhatan Factory was a large building 140 feet long with five stories, which accommodated 4,500 spindles and 52 power looms.²⁶

The water power at Gwynn's Falls was used by the Lanney Brothers in the operation of a mill devoted to the printing of calico and dyeing thread for their own and neighboring firms. At Jones' Falls, Rogers and Company owned a woolen mill which produced a coarse cloth for winter wear. The various mills produced a surplus of yarns which were sold to a large number of local hand weavers who produced a light summer-wear cloth. As mill production increased a spokesman of the Maryland Association predicted that a number of additional weavers would swell the ranks of the fifty small entrepreneurs already at work.²⁷

The outbreak of the War of 1812 served as a further impetus for the expansion of the textile industry in the state. The manufacture of woolen cloth was improved by the introduction of broadcloth and cassimere weaving and the improved fabrics of the cotton mills were said to be equal to anything ever im-

²³ *Enquirer* (Richmond, Va.), June 20, 1817.

²⁴ *Virginia Herald* (Fredericksburg), January 2, 1819.

²⁵ *Commercial Directory* (Philadelphia, 1823), 77. In 1823 the president of the Union Mills was R. Miller, Jr., who had his office at the company warehouse at 152 Market Street in Baltimore.

²⁶ *Virginia Argus* (Richmond), June 29, 1810; *Commercial Directory* (Philadelphia, 1823), 76. President of the Powhatan Mills was Nathan Levering; his office was at 220½ Baltimore Street, Baltimore.

²⁷ *Star* (Raleigh, N. C.), June 21, 1810.

ported from Britain.²⁸ The scarcity of wool led one company to begin the manufacture of cotton blankets which was an innovation at the time. The editor of the Baltimore *American* claimed that this new product was the equal of the woolen product and was not only considerably cheaper but an item of superior beauty. The cotton blanket, he claimed, was of great value and convenience to the American home and was a further step toward freedom from European domination.²⁹

The success of the pioneer mills of the embargo period led other Baltimore and Maryland capitalists to invest in additional plants. In 1814, R. and A. McKim financed and built the Hamilton Cotton Factory. This was the first steam powered textile mill in the city. The factory provided employment for 100 hands who operated the concern's 2,000 spindles in the manufacture of cotton yarns. The mill was located on Jones' Falls on French Street in Old Town.³⁰ During the same year Edward Grey, Joseph Taggart, William Rogers, and Robert Taylor built the Patapasco Cotton Factory near Ellicott's Mills about ten miles from Baltimore. Here in a large stone and brick factory the company housed 1,500 spindles and 20 power looms.³¹ Edward Grey, president of the firm, advertised in the spring of 1815 the opening of their Baltimore warehouse and sales rooms at 140 Market Street. The owners modestly claimed that, due to their superior machinery and management, they were able to offer the public as good yarns as any manufactured in the United States.³² This company's factory was destroyed by fire in January, 1820, at a loss of \$200,000 to the owners, only part of which was covered by insurance.³³

In spite of the textile depression after 1815 the Baltimore mills ran profitably and were not, as was true in so many parts of the country, to close down in the face of British competition. This local success is given ample support as evidenced by the continued expansion of the number and size of local mills. In 1815 Samuel Smith, Andrew Clopper, James A. Buchanan,

²⁸ *City Gazette* (Charleston, S.C.), January 1, 1814.

²⁹ *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D. C.), January 6, 1814, quoting the Baltimore (Md.) *American*.

³⁰ *Commercial Directory* (Philadelphia, 1823), 76.

³¹ *Ibid.*; *Maryland Session Laws* (Annapolis, 1816), 153-155.

³² *Enquirer* (Richmond, Va.), February 11, 1815.

³³ Providence (R. I.) *Gazette*, January 27, 1820; *Arkansas Gazette* (Little Rock), April 22, 1820.

George Warner, George Harryman, Micajah Merryman, and the mercantile firm of Price & Watson raised \$200,000 for the establishment of the Warren Manufacturing Company. The management built two large stone factory buildings at Gunpowder Falls about fifteen miles from Baltimore. The larger building was 140 by 44 feet, five stories high, and the smaller mill was 60 by 40 feet, three stories high. The two mills were equipped with 4,000 spindles and 52 power looms.³⁴ During the post-war economic crises poor management forced the company into bankruptcy in 1819 and the plant was sold for \$36,000 although the original investment had been \$200,000. The first stockholders lost their investment and the concern came under the exclusive management of James A. Buchanan. This reorganization enabled Buchanan to increase the value of the plant by investing another \$70,000 in expanding its equipment and production. In 1822 the Warren Factory was running 7,000 spindles and 125 looms which produced 78,000 yards of cotton cloth each month, 3,500 pounds of yarn, and 12,000 yards of calicos and other colored goods. The company provided employment of 900 persons of all ages, whose earnings varied between four and sixty dollars a month. The mill village built by the company was composed of eighty two-story dwellings, a company store, grist and saw mills in addition to the factories—the entire establishment was valued at \$250,000. The income from these facilities was said to be immense.³⁵

As a result of the profitable operation of the many older mills a whole series of projected textile corporations were chartered between 1815 and 1822: the Somerset Manufacturing Company; Franklin Company; Western Run Company; Union Company of Snow Hill, Independent Company of Baltimore; Savage Company; Maryland Company, and the Baltimore Company.³⁶ Although the textile industry in Maryland suffered some reverses outside of Baltimore after 1815, the mills in and near the city were sufficiently capitalized to avoid the problems faced in other areas. The panic of 1819 tended to cause a decline in business but the mills generally continued to operate. Their

³⁴ *Commercial Directory* (Philadelphia, 1823), 76.

³⁵ *Niles' Register*, XXIII (September 7, 1822), 1.

³⁶ *Maryland Session Laws* (Annapolis, 1816), 46-49, 128-132, 202; (1817), 14-17; (1821), 141-142; (1822) 66-67, 125.

success was in part due to the willingness of management to experiment with and pioneer in the production of new fabrics.

In 1819 John Skinner, editor of the *American Farmer*, began publishing a series of letters from his contributors which actively supported the industrial growth of Maryland and the nation. Hezekiah Niles of the *Weekly Register* devoted a great deal of space to economic nationalism and to promoting industrialization.

A series of letters in the first volume of the *Farmer* urged greater support for and interest in manufacturing activities. The people of Maryland were congratulated for their vision in supporting the two societies which worked for the improvement of agriculture and for manufactures. A writer pointed out to the state's citizens that either they must exchange their products more equally in securing European manufactures or they must support local industry—especially the textile manufacturers.³⁷ In a second letter the writer noted that the halcyon days for American products in the European market had ended with the Napoleonic Wars and in order for the American economy to survive there would have to grow up an internal exchange of products between the agriculturalist and the manufacturer.³⁸ In order to accomplish these important changes Americans would have to support at least temporarily a protective tariff until the infant factories were firmly established and safe from foreign competition.³⁹

In still another letter the writer countered the claim that there were some unhealthy aspects to factory employment. He claimed that the work at a loom was no more likely to contaminate a person than the use of the axe or plow—and that in the United States there was no reason for the unfortunate developments of European manufacturing centers. The very nature of the American people and their government, he claimed, would prevent these things from occurring. Further he said that “after all, an object of the greatest utility, and of absolute necessity to the future prosperity of a country destined

³⁷ Opifici Amicus, “Domestic Manufactures,” *American Farmer*, I (April 16, 1819), 22.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, (April 23, 1819), 29.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, (May 11, 1819), 52.

to give birth and growth and comfort and joy, to countless millions of inhabitants, is not to be abandoned, if it be *certainly* productive of *some* evils inseparable from human nature, in its present imperfect state."⁴⁰ A final letter noted the many advantages there were for manufacturing—a plentiful labor supply which would cause no shortage of farm labor, water power in abundance, coal for steam power, and the remarkable improvement of machinery which reduced the necessity for a high degree of skill. These advantages made industry as possible as it was necessary.⁴¹

The *Farmer* noted many meetings in Virginia where resolutions were adopted against a protective tariff, and where memorials were approved on this issue to be sent to Congress.⁴² These were answered in part by a Maryland farmer who attacked the Virginians for being unprogressive for not supporting protection for American industry.⁴³ It was becoming apparent that the expansion of manufacturing in Maryland was sufficiently great to bring advantages to farmers through the consumption of their produce. The Baltimore and other mills in the state were giving employment to many hundreds of workers—nearly 1,500, and profitably employing over a million dollars of capital in an entirely new activity. Maryland was the largest of the manufacturing states in the south.⁴⁴

By 1825 the Baltimore textile mills were sending out an ever increasing supply of textiles, and much of their yarn and cloth was being exported to the newly independent nations of South America—"not a vessel now leaves the port of Baltimore . . . which does not carry as part of her cargo *American Manufactures of Cotton* to the value of from ten to twenty thousand dollars."⁴⁵ One mill in the city was producing three and a half million yards of calico each year, while a Mr. Sykes was able to offer at public auction in the town on one day 350 pieces of

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, (May 21, 1819), 59.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, (June 11, 1819), 86-87; Cogitatus, "American Manufactures," *American Farmer*, I (November 26, 1819), 280.

⁴² *Ibid.*, II (January 28, 1820), 347-348; (May 19, 1820), 57-59; (August 25, 1820), 169; (September 1, 1820), 347-348; (May 19, 1820), 201-202.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, (July 14, 1820), 125-126.

⁴⁴ *Niles' Register*, XXIV (March 22, 1823), 34, quoting census of 1820.

⁴⁵ *Arkansas Gazette* (Little Rock), April 5, 1825; *National Intelligencer* (Washington, D. C.), February 11, 1825.

cassimere and satinette, and to get better prices than comparable British made goods.⁴⁶

The most logical development at the Baltimore mills was the manufacture of cotton duck for ship's sails. The famous Baltimore ship yards were building the best sailing ships in the world—the clippers and, after being tested by the government on several United States Navy vessels, the frigates *Constellation* and *John Adams*, and on several sloops of war, Baltimore duck was judged better than Russian hempen sails, and thereby brought an important independence of Russia for this naval necessity.⁴⁷ From 1825 on, as long as the sailing ship was of importance, there was a close relationship between the textile mills and the ship yards of Baltimore.

By 1826 the manufacture of cotton into a variety of products was firmly established in Maryland and with the advent of this industrial growth the city and even the state began to lose some of their southern characteristics. The tariff of 1828 brought a redoubled growth of Maryland's mills, which made the state one of the most important textile centers prior to the Civil War.

⁴⁶ Providence (R. I.) *Gazette*, October 1, 1825.

⁴⁷ *Arkansas Gazette* (Little Rock), May 26, 1826.

THE IMPACT OF THE CIVIL WAR ON EDUCATION IN MARYLAND

By RICHARD R. DUNCAN

THE bright optimism of Maryland educators for a successful school year faded sharply in the fall of 1860 as the national political crisis soon led to hostilities. The impact of the Civil War had serious effects on private and public education in Maryland. The loss of Southern patronage and adverse economic conditions created additional problems as well as compounded old ones for private schools. The public system also experienced a reaction stemming from economic factors. Most schools were forced to make necessary adjustments to deal with the new conditions, and those which were not able to accomplish this were forced to suspend their operations during the war period.

A number of educational institutions, unable to surmount the crisis, were forced to close their doors in 1861. The Patapsco Female Institute in Howard County and Mount Washington Female College in Baltimore County had both been successful girls' schools up until 1861, but with the loss of Southern patronage, the Patapsco Institute closed in May; while the Mount Washington College suffered a similar fate, as a result of the combined effects of the rioting in Baltimore on April 19th and its increasing financial difficulties.¹

The College of St. James, an Episcopal Church school, managed to survive until 1864, when it fell victim to General Jubal Early's raid into Maryland during that year. Before the outbreak of the war, the school had been regarded as a success, and church officials viewed its future with optimism. Enrollment in the 1860-61 session had reached 113, of which fifty-five

¹ Bernard C. Steiner, *History of Education in Maryland* (Washington, 1894), p. 270, and Alfred C. Roth, Jr., "A History of Education in Anne Arundel County, Maryland before 1865" (an unpublished Master's thesis, University of Maryland, 1944), p. 171.

were registered in the college and fifty-eight in the grammar school.² But by the end of the academic year in June, the alarm over the crisis had caused many parents to withdraw their children, and the number of students dropped to eighty-one.³

Despite the prevailing adverse conditions, the school's rector, the Rev. John B. Kerfoot, in his July commencement address, asserted his determination to continue operating St. James as before.⁴ When the school convened in October, only sixteen attended the opening sessions, but in spite of the inauspicious beginnings, the number soon grew to fifty-two. The graduating class of that year was smaller than usual and totaled less than half of the previous year. Kerfoot, in his commencement address of 1862, blamed the war for the plight of the college. He complained that if it had not been for this development, the new college building would have been paid for and that the endowment fund would also have been more successful. The rector further indicated that the decline in enrollment would also necessitate a reduction in the staff.⁵ The two factors which were largely responsible for the college's difficulties were the loss of Southern patronage and the proximity to the theater of war. Enrollment at St. James never again reached fifty.⁶

Earlier Confederate invasions of Maryland had left the school and faculty unharmed. The most serious effect of the 1862 invasion had merely been that the opening was delayed from September 24th to November 12th.⁷ Later in 1863 during the Gettysburg campaign, the school did suffer losses of foodstuffs, clothing, and other valuables which were pillaged by the retreating Confederate army,⁸ but in the following year it suffered a severe blow from the growing bitterness of the war. In retalia-

² *Register of the College of St. James, and the Grammar School; Washington County, Maryland, For the Eighteenth Session, 1859-60* (Baltimore, 1860), pp. 5-6; 10-11.

³ Hall Harrison, *Life of the Right Reverend John Barnett Kerfoot* (New York, 1886), I, 209-216.

⁴ Baltimore, *American and Commercial Advertiser*, July 17, 1861. (Hereafter cited as the *American*.)

⁵ John B. Kerfoot, *An Address Delivered at the Commencement of the College of St. James* (Baltimore, 1862), pp. 3-6; Baltimore, *Sun*, July 14, 1862.

⁶ Harrison, *Life of Kerfoot*, I, 216.

⁷ *Amercian*, September 26 and October 31, 1862.

⁸ Harrison, *Life of Kerfoot*, I, 260-266.

tion for the arrest of a Presbyterian minister, Rev. Hunter Boyd of Winchester, Virginia, General Jubal Early ordered the arrest of Kerfoot and Professor Joseph H. Coit. On his arrest, the rector proposed a plan which was accepted by General Early. The proposal provided that the two would be paroled on condition that they would go to Washington and secure the release of Dr. Boyd; if they were unable to accomplish this, they would surrender themselves to Confederate authorities. The mission was accomplished. Boyd was released, and the two men returned to their homes.⁹

However, Kerfoot's arrest resulted in the closing of the school, but it certainly was not the only factor in the decision. As early as June, Kerfoot had expressed doubts about St. James' ability to continue, and in the same month he was approached about the possibility of assuming the presidency of Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut. With the announcement in August that he had been elected to the position, coupled with his wife's ill health and doubts about the future of the college, he accepted the offer.¹⁰ His acceptance and the mounting financial difficulties of St. James brought about the announcement in September that the college would not reopen.¹¹

Location was also an important factor in the closing of three schools in Annapolis: St. John's College, the Female Collegiate Institute, and the United States Naval Academy. The closing of St. John's grew out of an investigation into its condition by the board of trustees. The findings revealed a number of factors which in varying degrees were also common to a number of other Maryland schools. With the war, Annapolis had become a military post, and the presence of large numbers of soldiers caused many parents to be alarmed. They feared that their presence would divert attention from academic matters as well as expose their children to infectious diseases. Consequently, parents were most unwilling to send their children to an area which was likely to continue to be a center of military opera-

⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 292-300; J. Thomas Scharf, *History of Western Maryland* (Philadelphia, 1882), II, 1241-1242.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 279-281; *American*, August 3, 1864.

¹¹ *American*, September 6, 1864, and *Sun*, September 8, 1864. St. James was re-opened after the war by Henry Oderdonk as a grammar school and a preparatory academy. Scharf, *History of Western Maryland*, II, 1241-1242.

tions, and many who had boys there withdrew them for this reason.

It was found that Northerners preferred schools which were not as close to the theater of war and which also offered cheaper tuition rates. College officials felt that St. John's, without an adequate endowment fund, could not compete with those schools that had been less affected by the crisis. On the other hand, Southerners were prevented from coming to Annapolis by military lines, while the number of students coming from Maryland was seriously affected by the economic depression; many parents were no longer able to meet the expenses of private education.

With mounting financial problems, St. John's was in a precarious position by the fall of 1861. The principal had resigned and two professors had already left the school. A committee had been appointed to find someone to fill the principal's vacancy, but they had been unable to find any qualified person who was willing to accept the position at the salary the college was willing to pay. The committee also indicated that the institution was no longer able financially to support a full staff of instructors without being aided by a tuition fund. In view of all the factors and the lack of any students from outside of Annapolis applying for admission, the Board of Visitors and Governors decided not to fill the positions and to close the college department of the school. However, the grammar division, which had always been a self-supporting department and which drew its students from the town, continued its existence.¹²

School officials of the Female Collegiate Institute also felt that local conditions were adverse to the conduct of a school there. The Institute, which had been recently established by the Methodist Episcopal Church, had been viewed with optimism, but with the excitement in the area, it was decided to move the school to a new location. Westminster was chosen as the new site, and the school reopened there as the Female Collegiate and Male Academic Institute on October 28, 1861.¹³

¹² *American*, October 21, 1861; *Annapolis, Maryland Republican*, October 19, 1861; and *Sun*, October 21, 1861.

¹³ *Minutes of the Third Session of the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Lewisburg, Pa., Feb'y 29-March 8, 1860* (Baltimore, 1860), p. 28; *The Fourth Annual Register of the East Baltimore Conference of*

For different reasons, the United States Naval Academy was also moved to a new location. With the secession crisis, the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, Captain George Blake, became increasingly alarmed over the possibility of an attack on the academy and the capture of the *Constitution*, which was moored at the institution's docks. Much of the captain's fear was based on the prevalence of Southern sympathy existing in the surrounding community, for he felt that such sentiments might precipitate an attack. Fearing this, Blake wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, Gideon Welles, in April, 1861, and proposed a plan which in case of attack would have destroyed those guns and stores which could not be carried away on the *Constitution* to Philadelphia.

The arrival of General Benjamin Butler and his troops in the last part of April completed the disruption of the school's normal routine. Butler's use of the academy as his temporary headquarters and as barracks in which to quarter his men converted the institution into a military camp. Captain Blake again wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, and this time he recommended the school's removal to Fort Adams at Newport, Rhode Island. Acting on the suggestion, Secretary Welles gave the order for its removal. The institution's furniture, books, models, and apparatus, along with its staff, were loaded on board the *Baltic* and sent to its new home for the duration of the war.¹⁴

Much concern was felt in Annapolis over the academy's removal and its economic loss to the community. Some were bitter about the pro-Southern manifestations which had been a factor in the decision. One letterwriter, in complaining to the *Baltimore American and Commercial Advertiser* about this sentiment, pointed out what the academy had meant to the community: employment, increased property values, and many

the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Chambersburg, Pa. (Baltimore, 1861), p. 20; *The Fifth Annual Register of the East Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Monument Street Church, Baltimore, Md.* (Baltimore, 1862), p. 26; and *The Sixth Annual Register of the East Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in York, Pa., March 4-11, 1863* (Baltimore, 1863), p. 33.

¹⁴ James Russell Soley, *Historical Sketch of the United States Naval Academy* (Washington, 1876), pp. 104-107; Jessie Ames Marshall, ed., *Private and Official Correspondence of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler* (Norwood, Mass., 1917), I, 33-36 and 43-49; *Sun*, April 28, 1861.

improvements in the town.¹⁵ A deputation of prominent local citizens went to Washington to interview the Secretary of the Navy. In the interview, they asked to have the academy restored to Annapolis, but Welles refused to consent. The Secretary indicated that under existing circumstances it could not be done and that any such decision would have to come at a future time.¹⁶ Fearing that the removal might be made permanent, both houses of the Maryland legislature protested and expressed hope that it would be ultimately re-established in Maryland.¹⁷

A number of other schools reacted sharply to the initial impact of the crisis, but were still able to continue their operations. Mount Saint Mary's College, a Roman Catholic school at Emmitsburg, was especially hard hit by the war. Many of the school's students were from the South, and by the spring of 1861 many had withdrawn. Growing war developments and the rioting in Baltimore on April 19th had spurred parents to write letters calling their sons home. Reflecting this development was the third collegiate class of the 1860-61 session; it had been so large that it had required division, but by its graduation year in 1863, it had only seven members. By the end of the academic year in 1861, enrollment totaled only 126 boys in contrast to the previous year's 173. The faculty had also shrunk from fourteen to ten.

However, it was in the following year that the college felt the most acute effects of the war, and registration figures dropped to their lowest mark in a half-century with sixty-seven students and twenty-eight seminarians. Despite the low of the 1861-62 session, the following years witnessed a reversal of the decline, and by June, 1863, ninety-four boys and twenty-seven seminarians were enrolled in the college. In spite of the mounting difficulties, college officials were determined to keep the school open and to sustain those Southern students who remained, whether they were able to pay tuition or not. Out of

¹⁵ *American*, July 27, 1861.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, June 22, 1861, and *Sun*, June 22, 1861.

¹⁷ *Journal of the Proceedings of the House of Delegates, in extra Session* (Frederick, 1861), p. 438, and *Journal of Proceedings of the Senate of Maryland, in extra Session* (Frederick, 1861), p. 450.

necessity, the college was required to borrow, and at the conclusion of the war, Mount Saint Mary's was heavily in debt.¹⁸

In the early stages of the growing sectional crisis, the Baltimore College of Dental Surgery had profited by the exodus of Southerners from Northern institutions. In 1861, fifty-eight students were enrolled in the dental college, and of the twenty-nine who graduated in that year, fourteen were from the South. But with the war, Southerners were no longer able to patronize the school, and in the following two years the number of graduates dropped to ten in 1862 and to eight in 1863.¹⁹

The University of Maryland, which was essentially a medical school, also suffered from a loss of Southern students. At the outbreak of the war, the University was flourishing, and the graduating class of 1861 was one of the largest in several years. Sixty-three received degrees of which thirteen were from the South and forty-four were from Maryland.²⁰ But in April, with the rioting in Baltimore, school officials became apprehensive of the general effects on the college. In an attempt to allay any fears as to the college's continuation, the faculty assured the public through the city's newspapers that they were "... aware of nothing in the present unhappy condition of public affairs of a nature to interfere with the regular and faithful performance of their duty as Teachers of Medicine."²¹

Despite the fears of the preceding year, the Baltimore *Sun* in February, 1862, reported that the university had been far less affected than expected. In the March commencement, fifty-two received degrees, of which all but seven were now from Maryland.²² It was in the following year that the most serious effects of the war were felt; enrollment fell to its lowest level and registrations were estimated to have fallen off 50 per cent. The number of students in the 1862-63 session totaled 103, while the graduating class consisted of only thirty-seven.²³ But, by the

¹⁸ Mary M. Meline, and Rev. Edw. F. X. McSweeney, *The Story of the Mountain* (Emmitsburg, Maryland, 1911), II, 8-14 and 34.

¹⁹ *American*, February 27, 1861, February 14, 1862, February 26, 1863; *Sun*, February 27, 1861.

²⁰ *American*, March 4-5, 1861.

²¹ *Ibid.*, August 19, 1861.

²² *Sun*, February 21 and March 3, 1862.

²³ *American*, March 9, 1863; Eugene Fauntleroy Cordell, *University of Maryland 1807-1907* (New York, 1907), II, 238--245.

following year, the school had begun to revive, and fifty-seven received degrees at the March commencement.²⁴

The Baltimore Female College, a Methodist school which received an annual grant of \$1,500 from the state, reflected more acutely the adverse conditions stemming out of the rioting in Baltimore during the spring of 1861 than the University of Maryland. With the upheaval in April occurring just after the close of the school's spring term, registration figures fell from 140 to a mere fifteen.²⁵ However, school officials were still determined to continue, and announced in the summer of 1861 that the school would open in the fall with a full staff and with facilities for both day and boarding students.²⁶ Gradually the college recovered from the initial shock of the crisis, and by March, 1862, sixty-eight students were attending the college. Enrollment for the remainder of the period continued to grow; by March of the following year it had risen to eighty-nine, while in 1864 it reached 113 and 120 by the close of the war.²⁷

Two other Baltimore schools, the Maryland College of Pharmacy and Loyola College, showed few signs of the adverse conditions of the times. The number of graduates of the pharmacy school remained fairly constant at five between 1861 and 1864.²⁸ Loyola, a Roman Catholic college which drew its students from the local community, experienced some growth during the period. In spite of the adverse economic conditions in 1861, not a single student withdrew for financial reasons during the session.²⁹ Registration in that year totaled 111 with a staff of thirteen, and in the following year this number rose to

²⁴ *Ibid.*, March 7, 1864.

²⁵ *Register of the Baltimore Annual Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Light Street Church, Baltimore, Md., March 5, 1862* (Baltimore, 1862), p. 18.

²⁶ *American*, July 30-August 3, 1861.

²⁷ *Register of Baltimore Annual Conference held in Light Street Church*, p. 18; *American*, June 27, 1862; *Register of the Baltimore Annual Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Dunbarton Street Church, Georgetown, D.C., March 4, 1863* (Baltimore, 1863), p. 23; *Register of the Baltimore Annual Conference, Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Wesley Chapel, Washington, D.C., March 2-8, 1864* (Baltimore, 1864), p. 19; and *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to the General Assembly of Maryland, together with a Bill entitled "A Uniform System of Public Instruction for the State of Maryland"* (Annapolis, 1865), p. 126.

²⁸ *American*, March 2, 1861, March 9, 1863, March 14, 1864; *Sun*, March 8, 1862.

²⁹ *Sun*, July 6, 1861.

115. A slight drop of seven did occur in the 1862-63 session,³⁰ but by the July commencement in 1864, the college had grown to 127 students with a staff of fifteen³¹ and 130 by 1865.³²

A number of other Maryland schools also escaped some of the more serious consequences of the war. The Anne Arundel County Academy fluctuated little between 1859 and 1862, although the school's indebtedness did increase.³³ The West River Classical Institute, a Methodist teachers' school at West River, was little affected by the war and remained prosperous throughout the period. School officials in March, 1864, reported that the Institute was enjoying its most prosperous year since its opening.³⁴ The Rock Hill Institute, operated by the Brothers of the Christian Schools at Ellicott's Mills, doubled its enrollment from seventy-four in the 1861-62 session to 151 in the following academic year.³⁵

The impact of the war upon the public school system produced a somewhat different experience. In the early part of the period, depressed economic conditions in Maryland had a significant effect upon it. Even though enrollment figures, with the exception of 1862, grew steadily, many students were compelled to drop out for financial reasons. Some parents were no longer able to afford the privilege of sending their children to school and needed their services at home, while in other cases families were forced to leave the area for the lack of employment. The Public Floating School was especially hard hit; it had been designed to teach nautical subjects, and drew most of its students from the poorer classes.

³⁰ Loyola College, Baltimore, *Catalogue of the Officers and Students, for the Academic Year 1860-61* (Baltimore, 1861), pp. 11-14; *Catalogue of the Officers and Students, for the Academic Year 1861-62* (Baltimore, 1862), pp. 12-15; *Catalogue of the Officers and Students, for the Academic Year 1862-63* (Baltimore, 1863), p. 16.

³¹ *American*, July 7, 1864.

³² *Report of State Superintendent to General Assembly*, pp. 126-127.

³³ Roth, "History of Education in Anne Arundel," p. 150.

³⁴ *Annual Register of the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, held in Staunton, Va., March 13 to 25, 1861* (Baltimore, 1861), p. 28; *Fifth Annual Conference of the East Baltimore Conference*, p. 25; *Sixth Annual Conference of the East Baltimore Conference*, p. 33; *Register of Baltimore Annual Conference in Dunbarton Street Church*, p. 23; *Register of Baltimore Annual Conference in Wesley Chapel*, pp. 19-20.

³⁵ *Catalogue of Rock Hill Institute, Ellicott's Mills, Howard County, Maryland for the Scholastic Year 1861-62* (Baltimore, 1862), pp. 5-7; *Catalogue of Rock Hill Institute, Ellicott's Mills, Howard County, Maryland for the Scholastic Year 1862-63* (Baltimore, 1863), pp. 20-24.

The depressed economic conditions also forced many families to apply to the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools for free admission, and as a consequence, receipts from tuitions fell off nearly \$4,000 in 1861. However, the economic conditions which caused the loss of students from among the poorer classes brought about the addition of others from wealthier groups. Many parents who would have normally sent their children to private schools were now forced to economize and to utilize the public system.³⁶ With the closing of some private academies and the adverse economic conditions, the commissioners in December, 1862, reported that the acquisition of new pupils from this source had more than offset the losses from those who had been forced to withdraw.³⁷

The return of prosperity in 1863 also had its ramifications for the male schools in the city. With the economic revival, the opportunities of high wages, as well as economic necessities, now lured students to seek employment at the expense of their education. School commissioners in 1864 reported that children twelve and fifteen years of age were filling jobs which normally would have been held by men serving in the army. The impact on the city's Central High School was felt in two ways: an increase in the number of withdrawals and a decrease in the number seeking admission. By 1863 the effects of this new development had begun to be felt, for in the 1861-62 session, enrollment had reached a high of 255, but thereafter there was a steady decline to a low of 205 in 1864-65.³⁸ The Floating School, which had suffered so badly from adverse economic conditions, now faced the new threat of favorable times and the lure of gainful employment. Finally its operations were suspended in 1865. Despite the overall effects on the system, the commissioners believed that the war had benefited it in certain respects. They

³⁶ *Thirty-Third Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools, to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1862), pp. 19-25, and Vernon S. Vavrina, "The History of Public Education in the City of Baltimore, 1829-1956" (a Ph.D. dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1958), p. 97.

³⁷ *Thirty-Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1863), p. 16.

³⁸ *Thirty-Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1864), p. 19, and *Thirty-Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1865), pp. 11, 24, 90-91.

felt that in inducing many of the wealthier families to send their children to public schools rather than to private ones, it had broadened the base of support for public education in Baltimore. In support of this, they cited the continued patronage of the system by many of this group.³⁹

In the excitement of the crisis, both students and faculty members alike were caught up in the currents of controversy. The respective merits of every position were hotly debated in an atmosphere charged with emotion. Faculty members, who felt strongly, joined the cause of their choice. Two members of the faculty of the University of Maryland resigned to serve in opposing armies in their professional capacities. Dr. Edward Warren, Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics, joined the Confederate Army, while Dr. William Alexander Hammond, Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, entered the medical corps of the Union Army and was eventually appointed surgeon-general.⁴⁰ At Mount Saint Mary's College, Professor Daniel Beltzhoover, a West Point graduate, resigned and joined the Southern Army.⁴¹

Students also enjoyed manifesting their political sentiments and utilized those occasions which were suitable for their expression. Several students of the University of Maryland were arrested in November, 1861 by military authorities for proclaiming pro-Southern views. University officials were embarrassed and took the occasion to lecture the erring students on their purpose in Baltimore. They were told that they were there to study medicine and not to settle political questions.⁴² At the College of St. James, ten boys in January took advantage of a debate to present speeches in favor of and in opposition to secession. Following the debate, Dr. Kerfoot asked the student body thereafter to avoid politics in essays and speeches. Later in 1862, as Kerfoot read the prayers which Bishop William R. Whittingham had framed in accordance with Lincoln's procla-

³⁹ *Thirty-Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Commissioners of Public Schools to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1866), pp. 10, 18-19.

⁴⁰ *American*, October 15, 1861; Cordell, *University of Maryland*, II, 237-238; James Grant Wilson and John Fiske, ed., *Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography* (New York, 1888), III, 69.

⁴¹ Meline, *Story of the Mountain*, II, 5.

⁴² *American*, November 23, 1861.

mation for a day of thanksgiving, twenty boys left the chapel as a sign of their disapproval.⁴³ The prevailing sentiment at Mount Saint Mary's was largely in favor of the South, and the head of the school, the Rev. John McCaffrey, was a strong Southern sympathizer. There was an attempt to achieve an outward neutrality, but the school's orientation remained Southern. The use of the American flag was discontinued, for it was reasoned that the flag now represented only one section. Therefore, the cadet corps used their own flag instead of the National colors.⁴⁴

The University of Maryland's commencement proceedings in March, 1862 almost ended in a riot, and the police were forced to maintain order. The audience, consisting mainly of women, took the occasion to show their political sentiments, and as the graduates received their diplomas, they were also presented with bouquets of flowers bearing appropriate political colors, while the audience hissed or applauded. In the ensuing uproar, the National flag was booed and torn. Finally the police intervened and threatened to expel any who persisted in such conduct.⁴⁵ In the following year, military authorities took precautions to insure that no similar disturbance or outburst would occur. Prior to the proceedings, Colonel Fish, the military provost marshal, ordered that a large Union flag was to be suspended above the stage. A small squad of soldiers was also stationed in the vestibule to arrest anyone creating a disturbance.⁴⁶

At the beginning of the war, the Commissioners of Public Schools in Baltimore had hoped to keep the city school system free of political controversy and influence. They expressed their determination not to allow such manifestations, and those instances which were brought to their attention were quickly checked. The attitude of the commissioners was that since the schools were public institutions, supported by the public and for the benefit of the entire community, that:

⁴³ Harrison, *Life of Kerfoot*, I, 199-200 and 227-228.

⁴⁴ Meline, *Story of the Mountain*, II, 9, 14, 16.

⁴⁵ Samuel H. Harrison, "Journal, 1861-1862" (Manuscript in the Md. Hist. Soc. Library, Baltimore, Maryland), entry of March 1, 1862.

⁴⁶ *American*, March 9 and 13, 1863.

Nothing is clearer than that the Public Schools, supported as they are by all the community, should be continued in an agreeable and satisfactory relation to that community; and they can only be so continued so long as they are strictly confined to their prescribed and legitimate duties.⁴⁷

But by 1862, the question of loyalty had intruded itself into the system as it had in other facets of Maryland life. Early in the year, the first branch of the city council passed a resolution requesting the commissioners to find out if there were any disloyal teachers in the schools or any who had expressed such sentiments against the government. If so, the commissioners were asked to dismiss them at the expiration of their contracts and to fill the vacancies with loyal persons.⁴⁸

The second branch, in considering the resolutions, offered a substitute calling for a committee of five to investigate the matter and to report what proper course should be pursued.⁴⁹ Later in March, the committee presented its report with a series of recommendations. Note was taken of the fact that no specific charges had been made against any teacher and also of the difficulty involved in making such an investigation. The committee declared that it would be improper to take any action on mere rumor alone, but recommended that no manifestations of disloyalty should be tolerated and that any one guilty of such conduct should be summarily disciplined. It was also their opinion that the teaching of patriotism was an essential part of education. In investigating teachers, the committee counseled caution so as not to take any measure which would introduce political controversy into the system and have an adverse effect upon it. Since it was believed that there was little disloyalty among teachers, they recommended that the board pursue its usual course and wait for specific charges to be presented before any action was taken. Finally, in summation, they asserted:

That this Board will promptly proceed to investigate any cases of disloyalty of teachers in the Public Schools which may be brought

⁴⁷ *Thirty-Third Report of Board of Commissioners*, pp. 25-26.

⁴⁸ *American*, January 25, 1862.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, February 21, 1862.

to their knowledge, and the Committee on the Schools respectively, and the Commissioners generally, are answerable to the charge, and the facts in the case, so as to be ready to report upon the same at the time of the next annual election.

The resolutions were adopted without dissent.⁵⁰

Meeting in April, the commissioners indicated that they had investigated one teacher accused of disloyalty but had taken no action. At this occasion, they did take the opportunity to recommend the use of patriotic materials for reading exercises by students. It was also indicated that any opposition to this would meet with their strong disapproval.⁵¹ Later in July, 1863, the city council passed a resolution which required that all music teachers teach their pupils national songs, and that if any refused to sing them, they were to be dismissed.⁵²

At the annual election of teachers in June, 1862, the commissioners paid close attention to loyalty, and a small number was not re-elected for introducing improper matter in their classes.⁵³ Later in August, the city council passed an ordinance which required all city employees, including teachers, to take an oath of allegiance. The act provided that only loyal persons were eligible for employment by the city, and that each person was required to file a signed certified copy of the oath with the city comptroller within five days. An appointment was considered null and void if the teacher did not comply.⁵⁴ Since the deadline had been set for August 20th, there was some concern over the fact that many teachers were out of Baltimore on vacation. However, the law was given a liberal interpretation, and they were expected to comply with it immediately upon their return.⁵⁵ In September, two principals and twenty-six teachers refused to take the oath; some did so as a matter of principle and not because of disloyalty.⁵⁶ Later in February, 1863, the pro-

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, March 26, 1862.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, April 16, 1862.

⁵² *Rules of Order of the Board of School Commissioners, and Regulations of the Public Schools in the City of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1863), p. 87; *American*, August 1, 1863.

⁵³ *Thirty-Fourth Report of Board of Commissioners*, pp. 39-40.

⁵⁴ *Rules of Order of Board of Commissioners*, pp. 83-85; *American*, August 15, 1862.

⁵⁵ *American*, August 21, 1862.

⁵⁶ *Thirty-Fourth Report of Board of Commissioners*, pp. 39-40; *American*, September 3, 1862.

vision of filing within five days was repealed. The new act provided that the oath was to be printed in a text book and administered along with the one required by the state constitution.⁵⁷

Military authorities, being interested in discouraging pro-Southern sentiment, also had occasion to be interested in the activities of educators. In 1863, the Rev. Frederick Gibson, an assistant rector of St. John's Episcopal Church in Huntingdon and principal of the Chestnut Hill School, was arrested for disloyalty. The arrest grew out of a letter which Gibson had written to a parent who had requested information about entering his son in the school. Gibson replied that Chestnut Hill was full, but in any case, since the boy's father was a Unionist and all the students at the school were Southern in sympathy, the boy would not have been admitted anyway. The letter was immediately sent to the Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, who in turn ordered General Schenck to arrest Gibson and to close the school. In his own defense, the rector maintained that as a principal he advocated no political principles, but as a citizen he deplored the war. On the understanding that he would not oppose the government nor allow any of his students to do so, he was released on parole. Since he had conscientious objections, Gibson was not made to take a loyalty oath, but as a condition of his release, he was required to display a National flag at Chestnut Hill.⁵⁸

Following Early's raid in 1864, the faculty and the president of the Maryland Agricultural College came under attack. The *Washington Republican* in an article, reprinted in the *Baltimore American and Commercial Advertiser*, accused the school's faculty of warmly greeting and entertaining a Confederate contingent as it passed through the community. The *American* called for an investigation of the charges, and in the constitutional convention, then meeting in Annapolis, a move was made to withdraw state support from the institution. To counter this move and to defend themselves, school officials in a lengthy communication to the convention denied the charge, and the matter was laid over. In a letter to the *American*, Henry Oder-

⁵⁷ *Rules of Order of Board of Commissioners*, p. 85.

⁵⁸ *American*, September 28 and October 13, 1863.

donk, the college's president, strongly denounced the report and indicated that he had not even been present during the raid. He also indicated that the college could have hardly fed fifty, much less the 500 which had been charged. Oderdonk also indicated that the members of the faculty, who were present during the event, had immediately given an account of their actions to Federal authorities after the departure of the Confederates.⁵⁹

Even though the adjustment to wartime conditions was often painful, Maryland schools and colleges generally survived the crisis. In varying degrees, a number of factors affected the educational system. The loss of Southern patronage and depressed economic conditions were the major problems which had to be overcome in the early years. With the return of prosperity, inflation created new difficulties and increased the indebtedness of many institutions. The hazards of invasion, as a consequence of Maryland's proximity to the theater of war, were always a constant threat to the existence of schools in the western counties. Despite these difficulties, most schools revived, while a number of new ones, such as the Baltimore County Institute at Cockeysville, were opened in the latter part of the war.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, July 22, 27, 1864.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Annual Report for 1965

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL

THE prospect that the Society probably will occupy the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building by the new year is exciting and stimulating. In the combined facilities of the new structure and those of the present H. Irvine Keyser Memorial Building our large and valuable collection of manuscripts will be properly processed and more readily available to researchers; our library will be less crowded; our maritime collection will be arranged to present a chronological panorama of Chesapeake Bay history; and our painting, furniture and other collections of artistic and historical worth will be better displayed.

I remember well the evening, fifty years ago, when Douglas H. Thomas, after swearing me, then Secretary of the Society, to secrecy, told me that within a few hours he would announce to a general meeting of the Society that Mrs. H. Irvine Keyser, acting entirely on her own volition, would purchase the historic Enoch Pratt House, repair and substantially enlarge it, and present it to the Society as a memorial to her late husband. Though many of us then wondered how we could possibly utilize the space in that generous gift, less than fifty years later we were bursting at the seams.

Now we face the happy responsibility of utilizing both the H. Irvine Keyser and Thomas and Hugg Memorial buildings to do better what we have been doing, to undertake new fields of endeavor, and to enter a new era of usefulness to the community vastly in excess of our most optimistic dreams. Should any of us within the last few years have allowed thoughts about the Society to become tinged with pessimism, that moment has passed. Surely this is a time for rejoicing!

GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE
Chairman of the Council

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Probably the major activity of the Society during the past year—certainly the major physical activity—has been the continuing construction of the new Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building.

This work has progressed fairly steadily and, I believe, soundly. The Society is deeply indebted to Mr. Abbott L. Penniman, Jr., a Vice President and the Chairman of the Building Committee, for the time, skill and effort which he has generously devoted to this work and to pressing for the completion of the new building at the earliest practicable date. Due to various causes beyond his control, this date will be delayed beyond what we had hoped for, but thanks in large measure to Mr. Penniman, I believe that, barring presently unforeseen difficulties, we may look forward confidently to the completion of the new building before the end of the present year.

The prospect of occupying the new building has, of course, called for planning for its best utilization. I believe that the additional space which we shall have will greatly improve our facilities for the care and use of our manuscript collection, which is one of the great assets of the Society.

Changes in personnel in the library and manuscripts department are covered in the report of the Director. We regret the loss of Mr. Kilbourne; we cordially welcome Mr. Filby and Miss Kamtman. I report with regret the resignation from the staff of Mr. C. A. Porter Hopkins, who has undertaken valuable work for the State Conservation Department. I am glad to be able to report that he continues his active interest in our Society and has remained as Chairman of our Special Projects Committee.

During the year we were able to put into effect some general raises in salary for the members of our staff, whose loyal and effective service is deeply appreciated and is vital to our Society. These increases were made after a careful review of our situation, including, of course, our financial status, by a special committee of which Mr. Charles P. Crane served as chairman. I think, that even with these increases, which were as great as were deemed feasible with our present resources, the level of compensation is still below what it should be; and I hope that we shall be able to find the means for further increases in the near future.

Mr. Samuel Hopkins, our Treasurer, will report fully on our financial matters. I should like to acknowledge our indebtedness to him for his unstinting and unselfish work for the Society. I shall not attempt to anticipate or duplicate his report, but will only say that I am very much pleased that we almost broke even in our last fiscal year. The year's operations wound up with a deficit of less than \$500.00. Any deficit is, however, regrettable.

The Society has had a number of very interesting addresses during the past year as a part of its usual program, as shown by the report of the Committee on Addresses. A notable exhibition of silverware was held in November and December commemorating

the 150th anniversary of Samuel Kirk & Son, Baltimore silversmiths, as is reported by the Gallery Committee. The Society is indebted to the Board of Public Works of Maryland, consisting of the Governor, the Honorable J. Millard Tawes, the Comptroller, the Honorable Louis L. Goldstein, and the Treasurer, the Honorable John A. Luetkemeyer, for permitting the U.S.S. *Maryland* silver, which was made by Kirk, to be included in the exhibit.

We have undertaken one major publication during the past year. This is *A History of the University of Maryland* by Dr. George H. Callcott, Associate Professor of History at that university.

During the past year the Council has resumed the practice of holding its monthly meetings on a regular date, which, I believe, have been very helpful. It certainly has been so to me.

The Society records with deep sorrow the death of Mr. John T. Menzies, Chairman of the Committee on War Records and a most valuable member of the Council, and was saddened by the deaths of Mr. Albert D. Hutzler, trustee of the Athenaeum, and Mr. Charles C. Wallace, member of the Committee on the Library.

With the coming opening of our new building, the activities of the Society should increase. I feel reasonably sure that even with the income from the Thomas funds, which will become available and can be used for purposes connected with the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, we shall have need for additional funds for our operations and for adequate compensation to our staff. As planning for the use of our new and enlarged facilities proceeds this year, the Society will be in a position to estimate its needs more accurately than at present. An appeal for further financial support seems probable.

I wish to express my appreciation to the members of the Council, of the Society's committees, and of the staff for their loyal and effective work for the Society. I am very grateful to the Chairman of the Council for his services in that capacity and for his help to me, as well as for his services for many years as President of the Society. One who attempts to succeed him in that office has a very deep appreciation of the extent of those services.

Respectfully submitted,

FREDERICK W. BRUNE, *President*

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

The year of 1965 may be described as strenuous but fruitful. The construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial addition progresses, with the important questions of whether or not to build the west wing or to complete the third floor decided in the affirma-

tive. With that knowledge in hand, a committee on furnishing the building has begun its planning under the co-chairmanship of Messrs. J. Gilman D'Arcy Paul and Bryden Bordley Hyde. With deep regret the decision was made to eliminate guided-tour service to school groups until the opening of the new building, 1) because four of the period rooms have temporarily been converted to protective storage use, and 2) because of pressing demands on staff time during this period of transition.

The staff itself has undergone changes. Miss Elizabeth Merritt early in the year retired after 22 years of scholarly and devoted work as editor of the *Archives of Maryland*. On November 1, Mr. C. A. Porter Hopkins, capable director of the Historic Road Marker Program, resigned to become editor of *The Maryland Conservationist*. Though neither program has lapsed, each position remains unfilled for lack of qualified successors willing to undertake the work on a part-time basis called for by the appropriations. Meanwhile, Mr. John D. Kilbourne, librarian, assumed a newly created post at the Hall of Records, Annapolis. Admiration for his seven-year service is equalled only by the happy selection of Mr. P. William Filby as his successor. Mrs. Wilhelmina Lord came out of retirement to serve as Mr. Filby's secretary, and Mr. Charles Ayres was employed as a part-time library assistant. For the highly important task of preparing the manuscripts collection for transfer to the new building the Council authorized the new position of manuscripts assistant. It will be filled February 1 by Miss Sandra Kamtman.

Despite such activity, it is encouraging to note that the publications of the Society continued with the issuing of two volumes (covering last names beginning with A through J) of *Maryland in World War II—Register of Service Personnel* and of *A History of the University of Maryland* by George H. Callcott, Associate Professor of History at the University. Sales of the Society's publications maintained a steady pace and the returns therefrom were instrumental in holding the overall deficit to about \$453.00. Much credit for this achievement goes to the Finance Committee and Mr. Samuel Hopkins, treasurer, and to those staff members who work in operations and sales, with Miss Martha Bokel, business manager.

Throughout the year, because of the construction program, staff members have been asked to assume wider responsibility. For their cheerful and efficient performance I am grateful. Working with Judge Frederick W. Brune in his first year as president has been pleasant and stimulating and I gratefully acknowledge the indispensable guidance of Mr. A. L. Penniman, Jr., chairman of the Building Committee.

Despite curtailment of the school tours visitors to the Society during the year totaled 18,374.

HAROLD R. MANAKEE, *Director*

REPORT OF THE TRUSTEES OF THE ATHENAEUM

The roof of the Keyser Memorial Building was thoroughly inspected, minor repairs were made, and the roof of the Pratt Mansion was painted. Plaster repairs were made to the wall on the main stairway. A listing of work to be done to refurbish the Keyser Memorial Building is under study. The building was maintained in good order by Mrs. Enolliah Brown, housekeeper, and Messrs. Russell Sheppard and Summerfield Baldwin Henson, porters.

LUCIUS R. WHITE, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE GALLERY

Members of the gallery staff are Miss Eugenia Calvert Holland, assistant curator, and Mrs. Virginia M. Swarm, registrar. The director acts as curator and Miss Holland has additional duties in public relations and liaison with other institutions and organizations.

During the year 100 donors presented 830 items, most of which have been previously reported in *Maryland History Notes*. Six long-term and 27 short-term loans were made to schools, other museums or historical societies, and business firms. The most important collection received was the bequest of the late Florence Schmidt of Baltimore, consisting of 11 paintings by Hans Heinrich (Henry) Bebie, as a memorial to her parents. Because of the crowded condition of the Society during the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building, the paintings have been placed in commercial storage. When hung in the new building they will constitute perhaps the largest collection of this Swiss *émigré* artist who worked in Baltimore from the mid-1840's until his death in 1888.

The first concern of the staff during the year was the protection of the various collections as construction of the adjacent Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building progressed. Paintings and other fragile objects were removed from areas which might be exposed to dust and vibration. With great reluctance several of the Society's period rooms temporarily were converted to storage areas because

of lack of space elsewhere. During this period other institutions are exhibiting or storing many paintings and other items, and the Society acknowledges with gratitude the cooperation in this respect of the Baltimore Museum of Art, the Peale Museum, the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts and the Chesapeake Bay Maritime Museum, St. Michael's. Special thanks are due the Washington County Museum of Fine Arts which, in addition to exhibiting and storing 53 paintings, provided them with protective backings at cost.

Portraits of James Hooper, Jr., unattributed, and of Mrs. Daniel Carroll by Wollaston, and the view of the bombardment of Fort McHenry by Alfred J. Miller were restored. The firm of J. W. Berry & Son continued its generous policy of restoring furniture at cost, cleaning and repairing a tambour desk and making minor repairs to the Lafayette desk and the music rack of an harmonicon. Mrs. Swarm assisted Mrs. Nicholas Shriver of the Women's Committee in retouching a number of portrait frames.

Six exhibitions were mounted and of these the most outstanding was "150 Years of American Craftsmanship in Silver" which ran from November 2 through December 18, and attracted wide attention. The display was staged with generous cooperation from Samuel Kirk & Son, Baltimore silversmiths, and Stewart & Co., Baltimore department store.

The staff answered many routine inquiries, such as attributing or dating paintings and identifying hallmarks, and assisted a number of research students in using the "J. Hall Pleasants' Studies in Maryland Painting." Miss Holland maintained effective liaison with a number of allied organizations, especially the Society of the *Ark* and the *Dove* and the committees in charge of Mount Clare and the Mother Seton House.

ANNE M. WILLIAMS, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY

Personnel

During 1965, the library staff were: librarian (assistant to the director, library and archives), Mr. John D. Kilbourne, until September 30, when he was replaced by Mr. P. William Filby; assistant librarians, Miss A. Hester Rich and Mr. Thomas S. Eader. Mr. Ronald W. Keuchen was employed as secretary, but was replaced by the recall from retirement of Mrs. Forrest W. Lord on October 4. Mr. Thomas A. Lombardi and Mr. William M. Howdon, Jr., were employed for part of the year as general library assistants; Mr. Lombardi was replaced by Mr. Charles W. Ayres on October 1.

Mr. Lloyd T. Bowers, employed as indexer, left on January 15, 1965. Manuscript restoration was in the hands of Miss Esther N. Taylor for much of the year, with assistance from Mrs. Lord from January through May. Miss Florence Kelly continued her work on the revision of the filing procedures in the manuscript index files. Unfortunately, because of lack of funds no additional summer help was employed for the second year in succession.

The Society is indebted to the volunteers who have furthered its work materially. During 1965, Miss Mary C. Hiss, assisted by Miss Nancy Ridout, Miss Eliza Funk, Miss Jessie Slee, Mrs. G. W. Cauthorn, and Mrs. Forrest W. Lord, continued the management of the Dielman Biographical File. Mr. Richard H. Randall, Sr., has performed numerous volunteer services for the library, more particularly in the field of maritime materials often unfamiliar to the staff proper. Mr. Charles Chafee worked several months as a volunteer on various short-term projects and proved himself to be a most valuable addition to the library. Miss Madeleine Wells, receptionist, assisted with mounting material for the vertical file, as well as in preparing cards for the *Maryland Historical Magazine Index*.

The volume of material sent to the clipping files has shown a sharp increase in the latter half of 1965 when the Women's Committee members added new sources. In addition to the volunteers named, Mrs. William F. Bevan has continued her valuable assistance in sending us important materials. Mrs. B. F. Newcomer has also generously given her time to the collection of items from various newspapers. The files are maintained by Miss Selma Grether, docent, with assistance for some of the year by Miss Elizabeth Merritt and Miss Louisa M. Gary. Mrs. Marshall H. Nelker of Pasadena, has lent copies of her valuable Anne Arundel County researches for copying.

Miss Betty Adler continued her preparation of the cumulative index to the *Magazine*. During the year work was completed on volumes 14 to 30, inclusive, leaving another 25 volumes to be done. Additional editorial tasks on this project, including the alphabetization of the cards, were performed by Mrs. Katherine Thomas and Mrs. Thea Kittel. The annual indexes to the *Magazine* are prepared by Mr. Frank F. White, Jr. The librarian exercises general editorial supervision over these projects.

Readers

During the year, 3,175 persons, a slight increase over previous years, visited the library. Of those who signed the register, about

18% were members. A slight change in the busiest times mentioned in previous years was noted, and the library was overwhelmed at Christmas and Easter, and had heavy use in the spring and at college vacation periods. Additional tables were set up during these periods.

General Staff Activities

For almost every phase of the library's work 1965 was a peak year. Although the number of readers showed only a slight rise (3%), the nature of their questions caused the staff to remain on the library floor for much of the day. Consequently many "house-keeping projects" which had been started often remained unfinished. The breakdown of readers is of considerable interest. Two thousand stated that their visit was for genealogical purposes, and 1,000 for historical research. Since the genealogical manuscript material, usually donated by professional genealogists, is almost always in a usable form from the time of its accession, the genealogical reader presents far less problems than the historical researcher, and every attempt has been made to make the genealogical section self-servicable. The moving of Filing Case "A", which contains thousands of genealogical records, to the main floor is saving the staff much stair climbing.

But the historical researcher invariably needs some attention. In recent years thousands of manuscripts have been added to a vault which has limited space, and filing problems have occurred. The researcher may need sets of papers, involving physical labor only for the staff; or he may need advice. The year has been one of acute difficulty because of lack of space in the manuscript shelves, and this will only be relieved by the inauguration of the new Manuscripts Division in the Thomas and Hugg Building. For the moment, a definite and sharp increase in the number of history researchers is noted with considerable pleasure, but it has meant that many projects, badly in need of furtherance, have suffered. Hitherto it has been recorded that the Society will appoint two manuscript assistants when the new building opens, but such was the need for additional staff that the Council decided to appoint one assistant in February, 1966, when Miss Sandra Kamtman will join the staff.

The high cost of maintaining the Society's files and the need for continual repair to the manuscript material led to the Council's decision to impose a charge of \$1.00 per day for the use of the library by non-members. Hitherto a charge of \$1.00 had been made only for the use of the parish registers and newspapers, but the implementation of this new charge for any use of the library by

non-members was felt necessary. In three months almost \$100.00 was paid, and it is estimated that at least 30 readers became members.

A sharp increase in the number of questions by telephone and mail has been noted, and these have tied the staff to their desks more than hitherto. School questions are increasing, and it is a rare day when an unusually interesting and absorbing question from the general public or researchers is not received. Between 60 and 100 letters are answered weekly.

Less manuscript indexing was done than in previous years, although a considerable amount of work was achieved on the manuscripts themselves. The librarian received more manuscripts in the last quarter of 1965 than a skillful indexer could process in a year—and the rate of intake shows no sign of diminishing. Indeed, since most printed material in the Society's library is available locally, the enormous increase in the number of manuscripts received is the most encouraging factor in the Society's work, for in many ways they are the *raison d'être* of the library. But many of them remain unprocessed and the establishment of the Manuscripts Division, long needed, is the only solution to this problem.

The situation in the cataloguing department gave considerable cause for satisfaction. Miss Rich catalogued 1,678 volumes (of 1,129 titles), a similar number of titles as in 1965, and this in spite of extra reference duties. A comparison with earlier years shows considerable increases: 1954—602 titles; 1959—961 titles. All acquisitions were processed currently and many volumes held by the library from older collections were catalogued.

Indexing of manuscripts continued, but at a slower rate. Messrs. Ayres, Bowers, and Lombardi processed many, but a huge backlog exists. This still remains the most disappointing factor in the library's work. A partial solution is forthcoming by the enthusiasm and care being shown by a team of Notre Dame College seniors. Twelve students are appearing regularly and are performing skillful work on the Brune and Randall Papers. Notre Dame students also catalogued almost 2,000 pamphlets, previously not on cards, and from these it will be a simple matter to check against our existing holdings. Miss Pechin Ingle has commenced work on the rearrangement of the collection of Maryland plats.

Although many projects remained unfinished Mr. Eader completed the card file of portraits of Marylanders to be found in books in the Society's collection. Messrs. Eader and Ayres have reorganized the system for the entering of serial publications. This resulted in the addition of new material where exchange institutions had failed to send their publications, and the ending of exchanges and gifts

where the director and the librarian felt that no purpose was being served by their continuation.

The descriptive brochure of the Society's picture collection made by Mr. Eader in 1964 had striking results; reproduction fees for items totaled \$465. In addition over 400 photographic and photostatic orders were processed, and service charges netted approximately \$400. In this connection, concern was felt for the valuable documents which were copied outside the library, and a Xerox 813 was installed. It came into full operation at the end of 1965 and the Society's manuscripts may now be copied on the premises without delay and with no danger of loss. It is also intended to introduce a program of copying whereby it will become unnecessary to have the readers use the originals. All processes concerning the copying of documents have caused additional work to Messrs. Ayres and Eader.

About 1,500 books were lettered by hand (an increase of 50% over 1964); only 100 books could be bound using the library budget, and no attention was possible to the many pamphlets and books needing repair.

In addition to activities relating primarily to the library, Mr. Eader assisted in the preparation of a case for the Kirk Silver Exhibition. He also attended the New York State Historical Association's seminars held for two weeks in July. His report showed that considerable benefit to the Society resulted from this attendance. During the year Mr. Kilbourne and Mr. Filby addressed 15 groups on various subjects.

Sumner A. and Dudrea W. Parker Genealogical Contest

The Parker Genealogical Contest continued to attract excellent entries, and another eight genealogical works were submitted for this contest in 1965. The thoughtfulness of Mrs. Sumner A. Parker in making money available for prizes is much appreciated by patrons and the Society, and the genealogical collection has been considerably enriched by entries since the inauguration of the prize in 1946.

Accessions

During the year, 505 "lots" of material were accessioned (as against 484 in 1964). Each accession normally includes more than one item, and one accession, the papers of Alexander Y. Dolfield of the German American Bank of Baltimore, contained almost 2,000 pieces. The year's accessions have been reported in detail in *Maryland History Notes*. The following list, therefore, is but a brief résumé of some of the outstanding ones:

BOOKS

1. *Poems of Francis Scott Key*. New York, 1857.
 2. *Analectic Magazine*. Vol. 4, No. 23, November 1814.
 3. *National Songster*. Hagerstown, 1814.
- (These three items, and nos. 1 and 2 under *Newspapers* are fully described in *Maryland History Notes*. They are gifts of Dr. Harry D. Bowman, of Hagerstown.)

MANUSCRIPTS

1. Letter (draft) of Charles Carroll of C. February 10, 1784. (Purchased.)
2. Many documents and letters with Baltimore and Maryland association. (Estate of Joseph N. Katz, through the Maryland Room, The Enoch Pratt Free Library.)

PICTURES

1. Thirteen photographs and 18 Daguerrotypes. (Gift of The Misses Stevenson, College Manor, Lutherville.)
2. About 1,000 items from the Baltimore Association of Commerce.

NEWSPAPERS

1. *The Chronicle or Harrisburg Visitor*, 1813-1814. Harrisburg.
 2. *The Gleaner*, 1813-1815. Wilkes-Barre.
- (Both were the gifts of Dr. Harry D. Bowman, Hagerstown, Md.)

MICROFILMS

1. *Maryland Independent*, La Plata, 1874-1926. (Purchased.)
2. *Columbian Harmonist*. 1814. (Gift of Dr. Harry D. Bowman. Hagerstown, Md.)

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Many MSS, books, photographs, broadsides. (Through the terms of Mrs. Louis Lehr's will).
2. *The Mariners Museum*, Newport News, Virginia. Catalog of Maps, Ship's Papers & Logbooks. (G. K. Hall, 1964.) (Purchased.)
3. Large collection of Maryland books. (From Nicholas G. Penniman, III, Owings Mills.)
4. Thirty books and maritime ephemera. (Gift of Richard H. Randall, Sr.)
5. Eighteen books on American History. (Gift of Curtis Carroll Davis, Baltimore.)

Maritime Collections

The presence of Richard H. Randall, Sr., in the library on almost every day of the week has been of great service. Letters from out-of-state, local telephone calls, and personal visits bring many questions daily which without Mr. Randall's expertise would remain unanswered.

Certain files mentioned in the 1964 report are being increased. The "ship file" additions are impressive, and those concerning shipyards, catalogue of sailing and rowing vessels, Maryland Privateers for the Pre-Revolution, the Revolution, the Pseudo-War with France, the Patriot Privateering, the Texas Privateers eras, and various other maritime lists, have all received Mr. Randall's attention throughout the year.

Restoration of Manuscripts

Until May 30, Miss Taylor and Mrs. Lord, and from September,

Miss Taylor alone, rendered valuable service in the preservation of the Society's manuscripts. Approximately 1,500 pieces, about the same as last year, were crepelled or mounted in part. The system (described in the 1964 report) is still regarded as the most satisfactory method, but a careful watch is being kept on the tests proceeding at the Virginia Historical Society and elsewhere. The crepelling is expensive, and at present only documents of normal size can be treated. Plats and maps will remain untreated until a larger press is forthcoming.

Special funds for the restoration of manuscript collections were generously provided by the Maryland State Chapter, Daughters of the Founders and Patriots of America, and by the Society of Daughters of Colonial Wars in the State of Maryland.

Library Committee

During the year three meetings of the Library Committee were held: on January 7, April 22, and September 30. All were well attended. Among significant items on the agenda were the following:

a) A statement of the library's needs. This was an important note by Mr. Kilbourne on the type of material needed by the library, and it was inserted in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* and in *Maryland History Notes*.

b) A request to increase the operating budget from \$3,500 to \$5,000. The Council increased it to \$4,600, but welcome as this is, the budget for binding remains woefully inadequate.

c) The protection of the material during the construction of the new building. Because of the difficulty in transport and storage it was decided to leave the library material *in situ* and to use elaborate precautions to protect it against the dust which will occur during the breakthrough in 1966. For many reasons this decision was the best because any interim move of materials from the Society's building would be fraught with all manner of danger and difficulty.

d) An estimate for the restoration of the original drawings submitted in the competition for the design of the United States capitol was discussed, but the necessary sum of \$4,320, was considered impossible for the Society's funds. To alleviate further deterioration a box was made for the drawings.

The incoming librarian, Mr. P. William Filby, who has prepared this report, expresses his thanks for the manner in which he was afforded every help on taking over in September. He records his admiration for the achievements of Mr. Kilbourne during his 7-year tenure. He also records his gratitude for the loyalty and splendid

work of his colleagues, without which the library could not work smoothly.

HUNTINGTON WILLIAMS, M.D., *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

Miss Elizabeth Merritt retired as editor of the *Archives of Maryland* during the year and the position has remained vacant because a qualified successor has not been found. A number of stock copies of volumes 1, 3 and 18 of the *Archives* were removed from paper bindings and put between hard covers. The committee recommended that *A History of the University of Maryland*, by Dr. George H. Callcott, be published by the Society, and appointed a subcommittee to outline a program of future publications. Another subcommittee consulted in Washington with Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, executive director of the National Historical Publications Commission, in regard to the possibility of obtaining the publication of the papers of Benjamin H. Latrobe.

An important assignment having made heavy demands on my time during the year, Miss Rhoda Dorsey kindly and efficiently served as acting chairman of the committee until October.

CHARLES A. BARKER, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The duties of your Committee on Finance are to advise the Society in the arrangement of its finances including the investment and re-investment of funds given or left to the Society by members to provide the facilities and the income to keep alive the historical and cultural development of Maryland. In rearranging the Society's investments your committee seeks to obtain the best current income that can be produced by prudent management. We also seek the growth of both principal and income.

In 1965 net income from endowment showed a substantial increase, mainly due to the receipt of a full year's income on Mr. Jacob France's \$250,000 bequest which was received in late 1964, and higher dividends on common stocks. The year's income also was increased by income received on \$102,715 added to endowment in 1965 from bequests of: \$10,000 from Miss Nellie C. Williams, \$25,000 from Mrs. Louis H. Lehr, \$65,008 from Miss Louisa McE. Fowler and \$1,000 from Mr. John H. Scarff. We also returned to endowment and received a partial year's income on \$261,713 which

was paid the Society by the trustee of the estates of William S. Thomas and John L. Thomas for expenditures the Society had made which were allowable costs of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building.

Looking to the future, upon completion of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building in 1966, an estimated \$1,300,000 will be available for the endowment fund provided for under the wills of William S. Thomas and John L. Thomas. At this time it appears that the income from this added endowment combined with the Society's other income will not be sufficient to operate the new building, adequately compensate our staff, and carry on a slightly expanded program.

Your committee, therefore, continues to believe every effort should be made to increase the Society's income and to watch its needs and opportunities. This calls for additions to endowment, more members, and the searching out of new sources of income.

Book Value of Endowment Investments, Income from Endowment Investment and Legacies, Dues and Contributions

	1965	1964	1956
Book Value of endowment	\$1,728,184	\$1,363,582	\$482,789
Net income, endowment, etc.	55,465	40,698	26,385
Dues	26,089	26,279	17,072
Contributions	4,550	11,301	3,050

ROBERT G. MERRICK, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP

Following are the statistics on membership for 1965:

<i>January 1, 1965</i>	Honorary	2	
	Life	87	
	Active	3,265	3,354
<i>New Members, 1965</i>	Life	8	
	Active	195	203
			3,557
<i>Members lost in 1965</i>	Deaths—Life	3	
	Active	88	
	Resignations	65	
	Lapsed for two years	36	192
December 31, 1965	NET TOTAL OF MEMBERS		3,365

The following table shows the number of joint memberships in the county societies:

Caroline	13
Dorchester	18
Maryland Genealogical Society	62
St. Mary's	22
Somerset	9
Prince George's	131

January 1, 1966

Members—Life	92
Members Active	3,271
Members Honorary ..	2
	<hr/> 3,365

The committee is planning a drive for new members to coincide with the opening of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building.

CHARLES P. CRANE, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ADDRESSES

The Society held six evening meetings in 1965, as follows:

January 11—Joint meeting with Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities at which the speaker was Mr. Frederick D. Nichols, A.J.A., Professor of Architecture, University of Virginia, who gave an illustrated talk on "The Restoration of the Gardens at the University of Virginia."

February 8—Annual Meeting, covering the election of officers and committee members. The program included the showing of a short film, "O'er the Ramparts We Watched," depicting events leading to the writing of "The Star Spangled Banner." The film had been shown during the preceding summer at the New York World's Fair. Accessions during 1964 were featured, and refreshments were served.

March 29—Mr. H. H. Walker Lewis, recording secretary of the Society, and author of *Without Fear or Favor*, a biography of Roger Brooke Taney, gave an address entitled "The Family Life of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney."

April 26—The speaker was Dr. Philip W. Bishop, Chairman, Department of Arts and Manufactures, Smithsonian Institution, whose topic was "The Craftsman and Innovation." Mr. Edwin

Tunis, Baltimore author and illustrator of the newly published *Colonial Craftsman* showed slides of his drawings for the book.

October 11—Mr. R. Hammond Gibson of Easton, acting curator of the Society's maritime collection, presented a slide-illustrated talk on "The Era of Sail in Maryland."

November 2—The meeting, which marked the opening of an exhibition to salute the 150th anniversary of Samuel Kirk & Son, presented as speaker Mr. G. Carroll Lindsay, Curator, Smithsonian Museum Service. The subject of his slide-illustrated talk was "150 Years of American Craftsmanship in Silver."

Because of inconveniences attributable to the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial addition to the Society's headquarters, only one afternoon meeting was held:

April 20—"The Architecture of Colonial Annapolis" was discussed in a slide-illustrated address by Mr. Bryden B. Hyde, architect, historian and vice president of the Society.

The Committee welcomes suggestions for speakers.

HOWARD BAETJER, II, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAR RECORDS

During the year the personnel of the Division continued the preparation of *Maryland in World War II—Register of Service Personnel*. Two volumes, listing Maryland veterans whose last names begin with A through J, came off the press and were distributed to key libraries, veteran organizations and government agencies in accordance with instructions received from the Board of Public Works. The volumes are not for sale, and additional distribution can be made only with the approval of the Board.

The committee suffered an inestimable loss in the death of Mr. John T. Menzies, its highly efficient chairman since it was established in 1947.

HAROLD R. MANAKEE, *Director*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The committee met on January 7 and formulated the following statement of its objectives:

To be worthy of its various collections, the Maryland Historical Society must interpret those holdings to all areas and levels of the community that it serves. The purpose of the Society, therefore, is

education—education in all of its aspects, from scholarly research to the simple arousing of curiosity.

Toward the attainment of that end the Society's Committee on Education strives to cooperate with other committees of the Society in encouraging and facilitating the full educational use of its library, manuscript and museum holdings at all levels of interest, but particularly by college and university students engaged in research and writing in the field of Maryland history.

The Committee on Education also endeavors to serve as a liaison group between the Society and other educational agencies, especially the schools, by encouraging the Society to establish a department of education for the purpose of helping schools with curriculum, course of study, and other historical projects related to Maryland history. In this area the committee feels that the organization of, and the rendering of continuing assistance to, student interest groups, such as history clubs and junior historian groups, will be of value in aiding the Society to maintain its leadership in educational efforts dealing with the history of the State. Finally, the committee strives to encourage all departments of the Society to coordinate their efforts to make it an effective educational force.

School children on visits to the Society during the year totaled 6,132 despite the fact that with great reluctance the Society suspended its school tour service for the fall term because of the building program.

THOMAS G. PULLEN, JR., *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS WITH OTHER SOCIETIES

The following allied organizations met on at least one occasion at the headquarters of the Society during the year: the Society for the Preservation of Maryland Antiquities; the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the State of Maryland; the Society of the Cincinnati of Maryland; the Woman's Eastern Shore Society; the Civil War Union Room Committee; the committee of the United Daughters of the Confederacy that assists with the Confederate collection; the Society of the *Ark* and the *Dove*; the Maryland Historical Trust; and the Maryland Genealogical Society.

The annual meeting of the Association of Historical Societies of Maryland was held in September at La Plata, with the Charles County Historical Society pleasantly and efficiently acting as host. Seventy-nine delegates represented 22 organizations. In October the president and the director represented the Society at the dedication of the new museum and archives center in Harrisburg of the

Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. In accordance with the recommendation made by Mr. Manakee, the Talbot County Historical Society was awarded a Certificate of Commendation by the American Association for State and Local History for "meritorious foresight, planning and effort in the successful establishment of the Chesapeake Bay Maritime Museum at St. Michaels, Maryland." During the year the president addressed the Allegany County Historical Society and the annual luncheon of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the director visited, or spoke before, local societies in Dorchester, Frederick, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot and Washington counties.

ROSAMOND R. BEIRNE, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE MARITIME COLLECTION

In the spring a large loan was made to the Chesapeake Bay Maritime Museum which opened May 22 at St. Michaels under the auspices of the Talbot County Historical Society. The loan included models, paintings, prints, tools, a sextant, a telescope, and other items.

A number of models from the collection of the Society were repaired. Mr. Gibson, acting curator, gave a slide-illustrated talk, "The Era of Sail in Maryland," to the October meeting of the Maryland Historical Society, to the Historical Society of Talbot County, and at Mystic Seaport, Connecticut.

The outstanding gift of the year was a generous contribution of \$1,000 from Mr. and Mrs. Marion V. Brewington, formerly of Maryland and now of Salem, Massachusetts. The fund is to be used for the purchase of two display cases and for the restoration of marine watercolors.

Accessions to the collection were as follows: From the Misses Katharine C. and Marie P. Owens, through Mr. John K. Barber, Jr., came an oil painting of the packet ship *Susan G. Owens* by S. Walters, 1848. Built by Benjamin Buck of Baltimore and commanded by Captain Landis of Baltimore, the vessel was on the Liverpool and China runs. From Mrs. Anne V. McKim was received an excellent watercolor by Cammillieri, Valetta, 1832, of two naval vessels under sail, "The U.S. Ship John Adams, P. F. Vorhees, Esq., Commander, 1832, and Brandywin [sic] Commodore Biddle." Mr. William A. Macgill gave a framed print by N. Currier after Butterworth of the clipper ship *Sweepstakes*; from Mrs. C. N. Matthews came two rowing trophies—a miniature Ariel Club oar in

black and gold and a watch engraved, "People's Regatta, Philadelphia, 1913," and Mr. Richard H. Randall, Sr., presented two burgees, one of the Windjammers Club and the other of the Sailing Club of the Chesapeake Bay.

G. H. POWDER, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE THOMAS AND HUGG MEMORIAL BUILDING COMMITTEE

At the end of 1965 the Thomas and Hugg Memorial addition to the Society was 30 percent completed on a dollar basis. However, about 10 percent of that figure is chargeable to materials paid for and stored, but not yet installed. Weather permitting, the contractor hopes to pour concrete for the third floor about the time that this issue of the *Magazine* reaches members. For several reasons—chiefly because the building permit was delayed due to unexpected requirements of the Bureau of Building Inspection, and because of an extreme shortage of skilled labor—the contractor has set back to November 1 the expected date of completion of the building. However, all knowledgeable persons who have watched the construction are pleased with the quality of the materials and workmanship.

A. L. PENNIMAN, JR., *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE WOMEN'S COMMITTEE

Members of the committee continued their valuable practical help to the staff, with Mrs. Swepson Earle classifying costumes; Mrs. Charles A. Webb preparing a cross index of the Society's holdings associated with prominent and historical personages; Mrs. W. T. Dixon Gibbs, Jr. maintaining the scrapbook; and Miss Pechin Ingle assisting the registrar with various and important tasks. Mrs. Kenneth Bourne began and continues working on a new type of index card relating to microfilms. A number of the members clipped designated newspapers, prepared folders for manuscripts, and assisted in the endless filing necessary to the prompt servicing of library and museum inquiries. Subcommittees helped with the preparation of several exhibits.

In March the committee recommended to the Council that Mr. R. McGill Mackall be commissioned to paint a portrait of the late James W. Foster, the Society's first director, and authorized a contribution from its own funds toward the cost. The portrait was completed in September and will be permanently exhibited when

the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building is occupied. In October Miss Elisabeth Packard completed the restoration of a portrait of Mrs. Daniel Carroll by John Wollaston, a project authorized by the committee in memory of Mr. Foster.

In June, through the generosity of Mrs. William G. Baker, the committee honored former Senator George L. Radcliffe, president of the Society for 27 years and now chairman of the council, with a reception and dinner at her home. Among the numerous guests were representatives of many allied institutions. At its September meeting the committee presented Miss Martha Bokel, business manager, with a gift in honor of her 40th anniversary as a member of the Society's staff. At the traditional annual tea for new members, held in November, the committee entertained 82 guests.

Members of the committee assisted at a lecture by Mr. William V. Elder, III, of the Baltimore Museum of Art, given under the auspices of the National Society of Colonial Dames. In the fall Mrs. Bryden Hyde and Mrs. Symington gave a lecture with slides to a group of senior citizens in Towson.

KATHERINE S. SYMINGTON, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE SEMINAR IN MARYLAND HISTORY

The Seminar in Maryland History met on March 31, 1965 at the Society to discuss a paper submitted by Miss Dorothy M. Brown, of the history faculty of the College of Notre Dame, entitled: "Party Battles and Beginnings in Maryland, 1786-1812."

Besides the author of the paper, the following members of the seminar were present: Professor Rhoda M. Dorsey, Dr. K. R. Greenfield, Mr. C. A. Porter Hopkins, Mr. Wilbur H. Hunter, Jr., Dr. Morris L. Radoff, Mr. Harold R. Manakee (*ex officio*); and, by special invitation to complete the panel for discussion of the paper under consideration: Mr. Paul A. Amelia, Professor Jack Greene, and Dr. Richard Walsh.

The seminar was brought into being in 1961 to create a focus for the scholarly interests of the Society; to stimulate greater use of its precious collections; to provide help and guidance for local and visiting scholars; and to assist the Publications Committee in finding and testing manuscripts worthy of publication by the Society. In the opinion of members of its successive panels and of the authors who have availed themselves of its services, it has proved its value. Its functions would seem especially to deserve active support during the period when the staff is preoccupied with the construction of the Thomas and Hugg Memorial Building. While it is believed

that the seminar has justified its existence, it has been called into action only once during the past year. This limited activity does not permit it to serve adequately the purposes for which it was founded. The active help and recommendations of members to whom these purposes of the Society seem important are earnestly requested to make known the availability of the seminar and to extend its usefulness.

KENT ROBERTS GREENFIELD, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL PROJECTS COMMITTEE

The Special Projects Committee continued its interest in the Society in 1965, meeting several times and presenting another Maryland Heritage award. The 1965 award went to Historic Annapolis, Inc. for its many achievements in the field of historic preservation.

Members of the committee continue to be advanced to other committees of the Society and to serve as liaison with other interested cultural institutions in the state.

C. A. PORTER HOPKINS, *Chairman*

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

Ten Light Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

The Board of Directors
Maryland Historical Society

We have examined the accompanying statement of assets, liabilities and fund balances of the Maryland Historical Society at September 30, 1965, and the related statements of revenues and expenditures and changes in fund balances for the year then ended, all on the modified cash basis as described in Note 1 to the financial statements. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

In our opinion the statements mentioned above present fairly the assets, liabilities and fund balances of the Maryland Historical Society at September 30, 1965, and the revenues and expenditures for the year then ended on a modified cash basis consistent with that of the preceding year with the exception of the change in accounting for investment income as described in Note 1 to the financial statements.

The accompanying supplementary information has been subjected to the tests and other auditing procedures applied in the examination of the statements mentioned above and, in our opinion, is fairly stated, except as mentioned above, in all respects material in relation to the statements taken as a whole.

ARTHUR YOUNG & COMPANY

November 1, 1965

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
STATEMENT OF ASSETS, LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES
YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1965

ASSETS

Current fund:

Cash:

Operating fund	\$ 14,440.56	
Building fund	431.10	
State programs (restricted)	3,808.26	
Cash on hand	100.00	\$ 18,779.92

Accounts receivable:

Magazine indexing	754.00	
Other	3,226.13	3,980.13

TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS		22,760.05
----------------------------	--	-----------

Fixed assets:

Real estate	100,000.00	
Air conditioning	10,330.00	
Books	1.00	
Manuscripts and prints	1.00	
Paintings and statuary	1.00	
Furniture and fixtures	1.00	

NET FIXED ASSETS		110,334.00
------------------------	--	------------

TOTAL CURRENT FUND ASSETS		133,094.05
---------------------------------	--	------------

Special fund:

Cash	23,369.53
Due from current fund	12,000.00
TOTAL SPECIAL FUND	35,369.53

Restricted fund:

Cash	23,245.81
------------	-----------

Endowment fund:

Cash	1,971.28
Cash deposit—Baltimore Equitable Society	90.00
Mortgage receivable	6,841.80
Real estate, at cost	581,271.94
Securities, at cost or donated value (market value \$1,381,970.48)	1,085,186.82
Due from current fund	52,822.60

TOTAL ENDOWMENT FUND ASSETS	\$1,728,184.44
	<u>\$1,919,893.83</u>

LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCES

Current fund:

Due to special fund	\$ 12,000.00
Due to endowment fund	52,822.60
Accounts payable	1,361.45

TOTAL CURRENT LIABILITIES	\$ 66,184.05
--	---------------------

Reserve for Latrobe Papers Repair Fund	2,216.91
Current fund balance	64,693.09

TOTAL CURRENT FUND LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE	133,094.05
--	-------------------

Special fund

Special fund balance	35,369.53
----------------------------	-----------

TOTAL SPECIAL FUND	35,369.53
---------------------------------	------------------

Restricted fund

Restricted fund balance	23,245.81
-------------------------------	-----------

Endowment fund balance	1,728,184.44
------------------------------	--------------

TOTAL ENDOWMENT FUND	1,728,184.44
	<u>\$1,919,893.83</u>

STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES

Revenues:

Dues and contributions	\$ 30,639.10
Investment income	55,465.58
From the State of Maryland	30,962.86
Other income	11,161.58
	<u>128,229.12</u>

Expenditures:

Salaries and wages	61,316.11
Library	4,807.55
Gallery and museum	2,517.66
Publications	13,504.81
Building maintenance	9,427.42
State funds	26,880.24
Other expenditures	10,228.56
	<hr/>
	128,682.35
	<hr/>
EXCESS OF EXPENDITURES OVER REVENUES	(\$ 453.23)
	<hr/>

SAMUEL HOPKINS, *Treasurer*

SIDELIGHTS

AN UNWRITTEN HISTORY OF MARYLAND

By AUBREY C. LAND

IN the five decades between the Glorious Revolution and the beginning of King George's War Virginians produced three books that qualify as histories of the Old Dominion. In contrast none of the several persons with a literary bent in Maryland turned his hand to a historical or descriptive account that found a publisher. Eben Cooke, or Richard Lewis, or Daniel Dulany may have toyed with the idea. All had modest skill with the pen and all had some knowledge of the century since the *Ark* and *Dove*. But it remained for a sojourner in the province to project a formal history of Maryland and to get down to several years of research on it. More specifically the person was Benedict Leonard Calvert, younger son of the fourth Lord Baltimore and brother of the ruling Lord Proprietor, who sent him to the province as governor to quell a conflict that threatened to break out in open revolt. Calvert's position as governor gave him access to all the public records and to the secrets of the proprietary closet as well. Historians might well pronounce both vantage point and time ideal for producing an unusual piece of writing. And, indeed, far from being a barren exercise, his studies had important consequences for the province. But Calvert never wrote the book and the story of his default is worth telling.

Benedict Leonard Calvert (1700-1732) had both training and temperament for historical writing. A younger son of Lord Baltimore, he had attended Christ Church, Oxford with somewhat more intellectual profit to himself than usually accrued to gentlemen commoners, who made university life as academically sterile as it was socially adventuresome. Calvert fell in with the celebrated Oxford antiquarian, Thomas Hearne, and shared his mentor's rambles about England in search of the old and curious. After he left Oxford for the continental grand tour ending in Italy Calvert wrote Hearne long accounts of the antiquities he met on his travels.¹ Between college training and this postgraduate course in the field

¹ Many of the letters on which these paragraphs are based have been printed by Bernard C. Steiner, "Benedict Leonard Calvert, Esq.: Governor of the Province of Maryland, 1727-1731," *Md. Hist. Mag.* III, 191-227, 283-342.

Benedict Leonard had about as much preparation for serious historical studies as most Englishmen of his age and station. Moreover he had acquired some practical experience in the world of business. During his stay in Paris he had negotiated a contract with the French Farmers General of Tobacco for his older brother, Charles, Lord Baltimore, the proprietor of Maryland. This demonstration of skill evidently satisfied the Lord Proprietor that the youthful Oxford scholar had the makings of a governor for the family palatinate on the Chesapeake, where for several years the administration had functioned neither smoothly nor effectively.

In July of 1727 Benedict Leonard Calvert disembarked at Annapolis to relieve one of his remote cousins as governor of Maryland. His arrival coincided with a crisis, constitutional and economic, in provincial affairs that promised to tax his astuteness and finesse. A clique of able young lawyers in the general assembly had challenged the Lord Proprietor's prerogative, especially his power to veto laws passed by the legislature and signed by the resident governor. The political unrest stemmed in good part from the sickly state of the tobacco trade, threatening the well-being of provincial planters. Their representatives in the assembly were busily concocting schemes for improving the staple, every one of them in some way a threat to proprietary revenues. This double problem presented the untried governor with a challenge that, as he soon realized, could not be met by familiar formulas. His whole administration was perplexed because the solution constantly eluded him.

Nevertheless Calvert made a brave start. He discharged his first duty of office by telling the assembly the unpleasant news that the Lord Proprietor would not countenance further whittling away of the prerogative, specifically the veto power. Of course, he put it tactfully. Lord Baltimore, he said, had laid down "this just rule for my Administration that Prerogative and Privilege should each have their due." But the delegates in the assembly knew perfectly well what this delphic remark meant, even before the governor spelled out the details.

Next Governor Calvert set to work familiarizing himself at first hand with the province. With the scholar's instinct for background he dug into the public records—the assembly proceedings, the body of laws, minutes of the council. Beginning no doubt in an antiquarian spirit, Calvert soon began to scrutinize the documents with an eye that would have satisfied the most exacting critic in a historical seminar. Before a year had passed he had resolved to write a "description and history" of Maryland. By March of 1729 he was able to tell his old friend, Hearne, something about the

project and to give him a sketchy syllabus.² Quite naturally Calvert's family pride colored his outlook, but filial piety did not blind him to the realities. He searched the land records, the rent rolls, and the commercial statistics for answers to the questions he asked. The data he gathered set him thinking.

Two obstacles slowed down progress on the pet project—poor health and a cold war with the assembly. Calvert was never a robust type. His hassles with intractable delegates in the assembly kept his nerves continually on edge, particularly during summer months when he found the heat unbearable. As often as he could manage he escaped to the north for a brief respite, but after two years he was clearly approaching a state of hypochondria. "The extream bad state of health he enjoys," wrote one observer, "is much worse than I imagined, and which I believe has not been mended very much by the help of Physick, which he takes more of than anyone I ever knew in my life."³ Wretched health and administrative frustrations gave Calvert a jaundiced view of his opponents, the "proud, petulant and Ignorant" planters who refused to see how tenderly his brother, Lord Baltimore, loved the people of Maryland and how zealously he labored for their welfare. By the time Calvert's administration was two years old he had become acutely conscious of the conflict between his own philosophy of government and the principles followed by provincials, his Lordship's faithful tenants, as the phrase ran. The people wanted altogether too great a voice in ordering affairs. In fact they demanded a positive role in decision-making and had found ways of enforcing their demand. Calvert put the case neatly. "This Superiority, as I may term it, of the people over the Government, seems Unnaturall, and is I am sure repugnant to the very End for which Government was Instituted, Viz, an Authoritative Influence for the good order of Society."⁴

In the end distractions of official duties and recurrent illness prevented Benedict Leonard Calvert from writing the history of Maryland he had projected. But his research had not been wasted. His work in the records had given him a kind of insight into Maryland problems denied members of the proprietary family since the days before the Glorious Revolution when old Lord Charles, his grandfather, had actually lived in the province. And he placed his knowledge at the service of his family in a quite practical way.

² Samuel Ogle to Lord Baltimore, 10 January 1732, *ibid.* III, 127. Also printed in *The Calvert Papers*, II (Fund Publication No. 34, Maryland Historical Society, Baltimore, 1894), p. 85.

³ Benedict Leonard Calvert to Lord Baltimore, 26 October 1729, *Arch. Md.*, XXV, 601-610.

⁴ Benedict Leonard Calvert to Thomas Hearne, 18 March 1728/29, "Calvert Memorabilia," *ibid.* XI, 282-285.

In October of 1729 Calvert sat down at his desk to write a letter to his older brother. Before he signed his name at the end he had covered twenty-three pages with compact prose, giving his own analysis of the chief problems in their historical setting: the quit-rents, the export duty on tobacco for support of the government, officers' fees, paper money, the balance of payments.⁵ Calvert had done his homework carefully. He had also done it thoughtfully. For each problem he had constructive suggestions, all of course conditioned by his authoritarian philosophy of government, but for that reason all the more acceptable to his brother.

Indeed his performance in this letter probably made a deeper impression on the Lord Proprietor and brought more decisive consequences than any formal history he might have written. The letter has a directness and economy of statement not at all like the vapid contemporary historical writing. It would be difficult to say what kind of prose Calvert the antiquarian might have written had he sat down self-consciously with his sheaf of notes to indite the History and Present Prospects of Maryland. He could hardly have avoided some bows to current fashions among historical writers and his book could easily have proved as tedious as William Stith's *History of Virginia*, and about as barren of results. Without claiming too much for Calvert's letter it is fair to say that the recommendations he offered on proprietary revenues, money, and like questions correspond almost to a detail to those changes made by the Lord Proprietor when three years later his Lordship visited the province in person to set his house in order.⁶

Benedict Leonard Calvert's term as governor was exactly at mid-point when he wrote the October letter to his brother. During the remaining two years he continued his research and the stubborn battle of wills with the leadership of the assembly. Long before his successor arrived in December of 1731 Calvert was confined to his sick bed with a malady he described as the "cholick." Debilitated from pain and nervous fatigue, he left Maryland with the spring fleet. On the first day of June 1732 he died and was buried at sea, and with him his unwritten history.

⁵ *Ibid.* The contents are given at some length in Aubrey C. Land, *The Dulanys of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1955), pp. 119-122.

⁶ For Lord Baltimore's action see Land, *Dulanys*, 127-132 and Charles A. Barker, *Background of the Revolution in Maryland* (New Haven, 1940), pp. 129-153.

REVIEWS OF RECENT BOOKS

A History of the University of Maryland. By GEORGE H. CALLCOTT. Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1966. 407. Bibliographical Note, Index. \$7.50.

Surely no institution of higher education in America has a history more complicated than that of Maryland's state university. It is ironical that Maryland, one of the last of the thirteen original states to establish a real university, demonstrated more interest in higher education in the eighteenth century than did the Carolinas or Georgia, each of which was to establish a flourishing state university long before the institution at College Park came into being.

A University of Maryland, built around St. John's and Washington colleges, existed, on paper at least, as early as 1784, but the abrupt departure of the brilliant William Smith caused this promising development to come to naught. The repeated false starts that plagued the University of Maryland are attributed, in part, to lack of consistent leadership. The author also points out that Maryland was in the middle ground between the South Atlantic states, with their strong state university movements, and the northern states with their great private colleges. In the South the upper classes were powerful enough to override opposition and to establish state universities without concern for public schools, but in Maryland the upper and lower classes checkmated each other, so that the state was handicapped in building either public schools or colleges. Problems of state sectionalism were also substantial.

The initiative in higher education was next taken by the physicians of Baltimore, who established a medical college in 1807. Re-chartered as the University of Maryland in 1812—despite the name it was a private institution supported by fees—the medical school assumed national prominence. Proprietary schools of law and pharmacy were also established in Baltimore, but an undergraduate school was less successful. Seemingly medical, dental, and law students would pay for professional lectures, but few would pay fees for undergraduate lectures. The state assumed control of the medical college in 1826, an act that engendered years of bitter conflict, so bitter that the state relinquished control in 1839.

The nineteenth-century failure to establish a state university in Maryland stemmed from "historical conditions, from bad luck, and from mistakes." Another factor was "premature success of profes-

sional education before a proper base was built for it." Unfortunately, Roger B. Taney, John Pendleton Kennedy, and others who held the position of provost of the amorphous university seemed to regard the post as an honor and provided no leadership in administrative affairs.

A new impulse in higher education came from the Maryland Agricultural College, a private institution chartered in 1856. But the new school at College Park was founded by wealthy planters who established there a genteel tradition that conflicted with those who wished a democratic "practical" approach to agricultural education. The clash between "pedagogical direction and social orientation" was to harass the Agricultural College for decades.

Thus, as of 1860, the several colleges that eventually came to make up the University of Maryland "possessed vitality but lacked unity, were advanced in the professions but lagged in classical culture." During the Civil War the southern sympathies of the faculty and students of the medical school were so pronounced as to arouse public reaction, and the Agricultural College provided a hospitable campsite for Jubal Early's soldiers in 1864. The struggling undergraduate school in Baltimore was a casualty of the war.

Nevertheless, the Morrill Act pumped new life into the Agricultural College, and in 1866 it became in part a state-supported institution. The school struggled for more than a generation to find its true role. As Callcott well states, most farm boys went to college to escape the farm. By the turn of the century, however, it had come to resemble other land grant colleges.

During the post-war years the professional schools in Baltimore struggled on, facing tremendous competition from the Johns Hopkins University. Finally, in 1920, behind the leadership of Millard E. Tydings and others, legislation was passed whereby the combined institutions of the University of Maryland were merged with the Maryland State [Agricultural] College, and the modern University of Maryland, with divisions at College Park and in Baltimore, was created. Presidents Albert F. Woods and Harry Clifton Byrd provided the leadership in the 1920's and 1930's that saw the University develop into a flourishing institution, which, according to the author, resembles the state universities of the midwest more than it does its neighbors at Chapel Hill, Charlottesville, and Philadelphia. From the struggling university of 1921, whose enrollment was numbered by the hundreds, faculty by the score, and appropriations by the thousands, the University of today has a student body of more than 26,000, a faculty of many hundreds, and financial support in the millions.

This study is educational history at its best. Broad in scope, it

contains an excellent resumé of agricultural and medical history in the United States. The author evades no issues; his interpretations are forceful, and he does not hesitate to call attention to shortcomings and deficiencies. Powerful figures such as Governor Albert C. Ritchie and Senator Millard Tydings are dealt with forthrightly. Most difficult of all, of course, is the career of Harry C. Byrd, whose twenty-year regime, beginning in 1933, was the most interesting and controversial of all presidencies. Byrd's role in the exit of President Raymond A. Pearson, his three salaries, his athletic policies (Callcott does not approve of importing "out-of-state muscle men" to play on the football team), his amazing feats as a procurer of legislative funds, his ebullient personality, the charges of anti-intellectualism—all are there. The picture of Byrd that emerges is not unfavorable, but the historian cannot restrain his dislike for the regime of President Pearson.

Some might wish for less detail in the earlier chapters, or for the inclusion of more state history, but why cavil? The product is a truly first-rate university history, a tribute to the aspirations of the author and his university.

DANIEL W. HOLLIS

University of South Carolina

Without Fear or Favor: A Biography of Chief Justice Roger Brooke Taney. By WALKER LEWIS. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965. viii, 555. \$7.50.

Walker Lewis' biography of Chief Justice Taney would have been a notable achievement if it had ended with his appointment to the Supreme Court. On every page the reader is struck by the astonishing research into contemporary letters and other source material. What emerges is a striking picture of the times, and of life in Southern Maryland, Dickinson College, Frederick, Baltimore, and Washington. Particularly intriguing is the account of the political in-fighting between President Jackson and the Bank of the United States, and the chicanery of the bankers.

But the author has accomplished more than this. He has studied, in lawyerlike fashion, the records and reports of the leading cases engaged in by Taney, and the opinions delivered by him in the course of a long and distinguished career at the bar, in public office and upon our highest court. The summation makes it clear, even to a lay reader, that Taney was, as has been claimed by some of his admirers, second only to Marshall as a Chief Justice and as an expositor of our American brand of constitutional law.

Taney did not have a devoted Story at his elbow, and his court

was far more prone to disagree with Taney's views. Like his great predecessor, Taney held firm the balance between conflicting claims of federal and state authority, and rode herd on the executive and legislative branches. He was not a judicial activist, and he adhered to the plain meaning of the words of the Constitution, as understood at the time of its adoption. One may suppose that Taney would have been shocked at the novel twists applied by our present court, its leaps into the political thicket and its rewriting of the established rules of criminal procedure.

Most of the criticism of Taney stems from his opinion in the case of the slave, or former slave, Dred Scott. There can be little doubt that the case was correctly decided and might well have been decided *per curiam*. But because two members of the court disagreed and proposed to write a dissent on broad philosophical grounds, Taney was persuaded by his concurring colleagues to give a full exposition. This included a discussion of the sordid legal background of slavery in the colonies, the states and the United States. Taney was personally opposed to slavery, and he had long since freed the slaves he had inherited. But his opinion, as quoted out of context, raised a storm of protest from the abolitionists and has been assigned as one of the causes of the Civil War.

One of Taney's chief detractors, in his life and thereafter, was the vitriolic Charles Sumner. Walker Lewis, in an interesting appendix, investigates the probable authorship of an anonymous pamphlet which bitterly attacked Taney and attributes it to Sumner. This libelous document did much to blacken the historical image of Taney. Taney was also condemned for his opposition to the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* by President Lincoln. Modern opinion leans to the view that Taney was right. His stand has been justly compared to the courageous stand of Lord Coke at a crisis in English history.

Walker Lewis' work is a major contribution to Maryland and national history, both for the wealth of new material and the re-working, in a lucid and entertaining style, of all the material bearing upon the life and times of one of our greatest judges.

WILLIAM L. HENDERSON

Gibson Island

Henry L. Stimson and Japan, 1931-33. By ARMIN RAPPAPORT.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963. 234. \$6.

Professor Rappaport's volume essays to show, "by examining the policies of the principal decision-makers and the moods of the people" in the United States and, less fully, in Great Britain and

Japan, why the United States and Great Britain "did nothing effective to halt" Japan's assault on the peace machinery. He tells the familiar story of Japanese military conviction that activism must replace civilian pusillanimity toward China, resulting in the synthetic Mukden Incident of September 18, 1931. He details the international disapproval which then pressured Japanese military and civilians alike into supporting conquest of Manchuria, the establishment of the Manchukuoan puppet state, the Lytton Commission's castigation of Japan, and the latter's departure from the League of Nations.

The focus is on Henry L. Stimson, as has been that in earlier accounts by Richard N. Current, Robert H. Ferrell, and Elting E. Morison. The story takes the Secretary through a month of "parallel but independent" support of League resolutions of September 22, dictated by a desire to give civilian moderates a chance to bring military hotheads into line. When the League set a deadline for Japanese withdrawal, Stimson refused to follow, but when Japan occupied Chinchow in early 1932, strong feeling led him to issue the nonrecognition statement of January 7, the least vigorous among several alternatives. Further hostilities drew two additional statements, the letter of February 24 to Senator William E. Borah, with implied threat of renewed American military activity in the Pacific, and the address of August 8 to the Council on Foreign Relations. However mild, these pronouncements outpaced American military potential and public interest in the Far East, and served only to focus Japanese antipathy on the United States. In all this, Stimson was hampered by his desire to check international brigandage by several factors—a cautious Quaker in the White House, the pro-Japanese attitudes of British Tories and French politicians, the incompetence of Ambassador W. Cameron Forbes, and Chinese military ineffectiveness despite desperate defensive measures—all of which contributed to American inaction and League impotence.

Where earlier accounts have produced variant judgments, this one is less categorical about what happened at Mukden, asserts that Stimson "did not favor economic sanctions," and that his name, rather than Herbert Hoover's, should attach to the non-recognition doctrine. Rappaport is less convinced than some of Stimson's personal unwillingness to travel a vigorous path, and emphasizes somewhat less such peripheral but important factors as European politics and the depression, though he stresses more than anyone to date British Torydom's pro-Japanese attitude. His somewhat lenient judgment finds the Secretary's "tragedy" in his inability to "marshal support at home or abroad." An inadequate

index and a number of mechanical errors detract from the overall excellence of this most complete study of the initial failure of the peace machinery.

L. ETHAN ELLIS

Seton Hall University

Slavery and Jeffersonian Virginia. By ROBERT MCCOLLEY. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1964. 227. \$5.

Professor McColley's indictment of the men in power in old Virginia is severe. They did little to remove slavery from their state despite the passage of laws in 1782 permitting voluntary manumission and in 1788 prohibiting the importation of slaves. They increased the domestic slave trade by selling their own slaves into other states. After the Gabriel Conspiracy of 1800 they enforced slave codes promulgated in the 1790's, and then they passed restrictive laws against free Negroes. With the purchase of the Louisiana Territory, Thomas Jefferson guaranteed a sanctuary for Spanish and French slavery in its vast lands. All this went on, McColley charges, behind a mask of concern for the theoretical immortality of slavery while Virginia's slaveholders, led by Jefferson himself, subscribed to racist beliefs in the innate inferiority of Negroes, though not of Indians. Virginians were, he writes, "in the peculiar position of repeatedly describing an evil and then proceeding to insist that nothing could be done about it."

In explaining the social setting for these attitudes, McColley is more convincing in his assertion that the "aristocratic" habits of planters could not be maintained without slavery than he is through his argument, unsupported by statistical findings, that slavery continued to be profitable after the advent of the cotton gin. Even so, we would be helped by a keener inquiry into slavery sentiments among Virginians from different parts of the state. As for the label "aristocratic," I would prefer to see it dropped in favor of other adjectives such as "powerful," or "elitist," "cultured," "gentlemanly," or "landed." Most of McColley's "aristocratic" slaveholders had had the chance in the constitutional period to propose that Virginia and the nation be led by titled and landed aristocrats. They had turned it down. His claim, moreover, that the "aristocrats" were "characteristically only consumers, and not producers of painting, poetry, novels, histories, and political tracts" has been refuted by Richard Beale Davis, whose book appeared too late for McColley to use. Most of all I wish that McColley had taken his story down to the Virginia slavery debates of 1831-32 when for many historians the Jeffersonian era in Virginia truly ended. In that

legislative winter a minority of young westerners and senior statesmen for the last time put forth vigorous and thoughtful antislavery arguments partly in Jeffersonian language.

Despite its limited range, this is a book to be reckoned with. It stands beside Leonard Levy's study of "the darker side" of Jefferson and civil liberties in questioning some standard modern liberal images. Naturally, for those of us brought up on the works of Claude Bowers or Gilbert Chinard or Dumas Malone it is a chastening experience to read McColley's description of "the conflicting attachments of old Virginia to human liberty and Negro slavery." Some may raise the charge that it is written from the perspective of today's liberal civil rights ideology and hence is unfair and "unhistorical" in its judgments of what Jefferson failed to do. The charge may be quite true—and quite beside the point of what we should try to understand about change in the writing of history. "Standard" views of history do not remain long in vogue, and particularly in Jeffersonian historiography, as Merrill Peterson has shown, there have been some dramatic turns. To readjust one's historical thinking to present needs, in the spirit of Jeffersonian utility, can mean to emphasize what has not been emphasized before about the past. It does not mean necessarily to distort the past, and this McColley has not done. Nor is his a debunking book: he simply tells us that although Jefferson took the steps against slavery in his own state that political prudence would allow, these steps were few and halting by our lights and they lagged behind those of such men as John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, Benjamin Franklin, or Jefferson's fellow Virginians, Thomas Coke, Robert Pleasants, and Warner Mifflin.

In connection with Coke, Pleasants, and Mifflin, McColley strikes another blow for free inquiry in the face of academic stereotypes. For him, these men were the "true emancipators" within the Old Dominion. Coke represented Methodist antislavery opinion, short-lived though it was in the 1780's and 1790's, while Pleasants and Mifflin led Virginia Quakers against slavery under the ideas of the Philadelphians, John Woolman and Anthony Benezet. Although Quakers and Methodists were beginning a quiet but enduring antislavery tradition within left-wing Protestantism, the point here is that on the score of Negro rights they were "liberal" in the modern secular sense. One overworked academic stereotype of our age frequently has them theologically narrow or beyond "reasonable" Christianity, and therefore anti-intellectual and illiberal. McColley is showing that in this matter of slavery in old Virginia they put to shame the Jeffersonian intellectuals of enlightened reason, with whom the modern American intellectual frequently has claimed

direct kinship. There are, of course, various channels in western libertarian thought, and one need not have been for Negro liberty to be for intellectual liberty in Jefferson's time. But it is refreshing, if startling, to learn where our early Virginia statesmen stood in the libertarian tradition now that the angle of vision upon human liberty is changing. In reexamining our historical perspective on slavery in Virginia this book is a reminder that our first concern is the idea of human liberty, not our stereotype of American Progressive historiography. Surely the spirit of Mr. Jefferson can take such rethinking. It even insists upon it.

WILSON SMITH

University of California
Davis

Jim Crow's Defense: Anti-Negro Thought In America, 1900-1930.

By I. A. NEWBY. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965. xv, 230. \$6.50.

Georgia born and California educated, I. A. Newby has passionately analyzed the racism permeating every segment of American society (North and South) from 1900 to 1930. Convinced of the Negro's innate inferiority, dreading an assault on white womanhood, consciously or unconsciously aided and abetted by scientists, social scientists, ministers, and historians, racists sought to convince the nation of the "catastrophic" consequences of social and political equality of whites and Negroes—miscegenation and destruction of the superior (white) civilization, that only the South understood the "Negro problem," and that Negroes cheerfully accepted repression and segregation. Profusely documented, well-written, and including numerous quotations, Newby's book admirably captures the aspirations, paradoxes, and contradictions of racist philosophy. While many of the persons cited are well known to either historians, psychologists, sociologists, or anthropologists, this is the first time their views have been treated systematically in one volume.

The chief value of the work is the unparalleled re-creation of the "spirit of the times" which permitted such an extensive forum for airing racist views. One is somewhat chagrined, however, at Newby's castigation of the scientists for capitulation to the dominant racism of the time and his excuse of the racism of historians *because* of its dominance in society. While his assessment of the forces producing racism is excellent, his discussion of its decline is incomplete. Even so, the book not only provides one with a panoramic view of the reaction against Negroes during the period surveyed, but it also gives one insight into some of the underlying forces preventing

improvement of the Negro's position in contemporary American society.

JOHN W. BLASSINGAME

Yale University

The End of an Era. By JOHN SERGEANT WISE. Edited and annotated by CURTIS CARROLL DAVIS. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1965. lxiii, 498. \$8.50.

The South won the literary Civil War, and books like *The End of an Era*, which first appeared in 1899, contributed mightily to the redress of Appomattox. John S. Wise avowed that his work was "not an autobiography alone," and that "Southern life and feelings and civilization" during the Civil War era were his subject matter. He succeeded, to a remarkable degree, in evoking the South as he saw and sensed it, and his portrait is compelling and often winning. Undoubtedly many of his northern readers at the turn of the century felt a bit less secure about the certainties they had imbibed from the "War of the Rebellion" school of writers. Wise was a superb advocate of the South's cause, at once disarming and determined.

The author, the son of Henry A. Wise, a prominent Virginia politician and governor during the 1850's, was but fifteen years old when the war broke out. He attended V.M.I. and served during the collapse of the Confederacy, briefly in the line and as a junior staff officer. Some of his recollections may be fanciful, and war on the rebel side may not have been all Lee and Wise, as one might gather from a hasty reading, but Wise's literary ability and skill as a raconteur make the book a delight. There are many historically useful sections on the Confederate home front, particularly those describing social and economic conditions behind the lines.

This new edition comes with no changes in the text, but editor Curtis C. Davis has added a lengthy and thoughtful "brief" on Wise, the man and the author, which is based on examination of family papers and which serves its stated purposes admirably. All in all, this is a fine work, which has been attractively re-introduced. Wise would have approved heartily of Davis's essay.

FRANK OTTO GATELL

*University of California
Los Angeles*

Archeology and the Historical Society. By J. C. HARRINGTON. Nashville: The American Association for State and Local History, 1965. 48. \$1.

Although it has been repeatedly demonstrated that historic sites in the New World are amenable to archaeological study, the

purposes and scope of such investigations have sometimes been misunderstood. On other occasions the potential contributions of such studies to further knowledge of the past have been completely overlooked. Using well-chosen examples, with revealing photographs and plans, Harrington here offers practical advice, not on how to excavate but about planning and carrying out investigations of the kind, once the need for them is recognized. As the testimony of an expert witness this discussion should be known to all those who are dedicated to the protection and best use of the surviving material evidences of the past, portable and non-portable alike. Accompanying the text is a useful list of selected references for further study.

G. HUBERT SMITH

*Smithsonian Institution
Lincoln, Nebraska*

Under Their Vine and Fig Tree: Travels Through America in 1797-1799, 1805. By JULIAN URSYN NIEMCEWICZ. Translated and edited by METCHIE J. E. BUDKA. Elizabeth, N. J.: The Grassmann Publishing Company, Inc., 1965. Published as Volume XIV in the Collections of the New Jersey Historical Society at Newark. lvii, 398. \$10.

America, quite properly, has been described as a "nation of immigrants" since even the Indians journeyed to this new world. They, unlike the later travellers, settlers, refugees and adventurers from Europe, left no written record of their migrations. The uprooted Europeans, however, have recorded what they saw, or at least wrote about the experiences which might interest their "stay-at-home" readers. So far, the best accounts have been produced by travellers from western Europe but to these may now be added the work of a Polish exile.

In 1797, the young American Republic seemed a welcome haven for Julian Niemcewicz and General Tadeusz Kosciuszko. Three years earlier, they had attempted to defend the independence of their nation against the combined might of Russia and Prussia. Kosciuszko, who had previously served in America's revolutionary army, commanded the Polish forces while Niemcewicz acted as his adjutant and Secretary of State. In the climactic battle, both men were wounded and captured. When Catherine the Great died two years later, Kosciuszko and Niemcewicz were released from prison; they emigrated together but Kosciuszko stayed in America only ten months. Niemcewicz travelled a bit, partly to cover Kosciuszko's sudden departure, and then settled down for about a decade in

Elizabeth, New Jersey. This town, inhabited by a number of French exiles and by at least one possibly bigamous English lord, became the home base for other trips—notably one to Niagara Falls in 1805. Julian Niemcewicz returned to his native land when in 1807 Napoleon recreated a Polish state.

Even before his American exile, Niemcewicz had begun to keep travel notebooks. He had already published a verse-description of a journey to the Ukraine and an account of a trip to Italy. Throughout his life, Niemcewicz was a prolific, if not a great writer. It seemed almost natural for him to keep notes of what he saw in America with the intention of eventually producing a more polished account. His public service, however, forestalled this plan. When he was again exiled in 1831, his notebooks were left behind.

After his death in 1841, brief excerpts from the eight American notebooks were published at infrequent intervals. A short selection in which he described Mount Vernon and George Washington was translated into English and reprinted in 1902. This edition now makes the whole corpus available to students of the period and to others who just like to read about America in its youth.

Niemcewicz's travel-journals are both interesting and of value because of the perceptiveness and diligence of the author. He questioned, listened, and looked carefully; an evening's rest at an inn found him recording what he had seen and heard during the day. There are brief gaps when presumably pen or paper or energy were lacking but the reader still gets a connected and charming description of the way Americans lived in the decade after the establishment of the new Constitution. Among the better "set-pieces" is the warm portrait of George Washington in retirement. Niemcewicz's itinerary also carried him through several parts of Maryland. He visited Baltimore twice and his description of a funeral near Woodsborough on his way to Taneytown provides the occasion for a meditative contrast between the simplicity of American obsequies with the gloom, clangor, and bellowing of the European. He repeatedly contrasted American government, society, and customs with those of the Old World, usually to the disadvantage of the latter.

The book is well-produced, easy reading and worth the price. It compares not unfavorably, both in form and substance, with the recently published travel diaries of Chastellux and Crèvecoeur. None of these books necessitate any major revisions in our understanding of the period, but bring us closer to the daily life of post-revolutionary America.

NICHOLAS VARGA

Loyola College

An Historian And The Civil War. By AVERY CRAVEN. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964. 233. \$5.95.

The Civil War Centennial probably inspired the publication of this book. Its collection of reprinted essays, rather than presenting "... the troubled course which one historian followed in trying to unravel the mysteries of the coming of the Civil War (p. 2)", shows that Mr. Craven has espoused a thesis about the outbreak of the Civil War that has not changed for many decades. There is no intellectual adventure in these pages; consequently, little is gained by the publication of the pieces in a book when they are easily available in their original publications.

The book contains fourteen pieces written over three decades. Of the eleven that concern the coming of the Civil War, two are reprinted articles, two are excerpts from books, six are reprints of addresses, and one's provenance, "Why the Southern States Seceded," is not given. Three of the essays are not directly germane to the rise of the conflict.

The collection offers an historian's dogma. By the time one has read the last of the eleven articles concerned with the causes of the Civil War, he will never forget that Mr. Craven asseverates that the growth of an aggressive industrial economy in the North stimulated a political, social, and moral campaign against the agricultural South, which produced such surging emotions in both sections that battle had become inevitable by the spring of 1861. The author's thesis first appears in this volume in the essay, "Coming of the War Between the States: An Interpretation," a paper read at a professional meeting in December, 1935. The final essay (152 pages later), "An Historical Adventure," also read before a professional meeting in April, 1964, contains the same explanation apropos the coming of the Civil War.

Aside from the repetition of the basic thesis, the essays impress the reader with several ancillary views of the author's. Mr. Craven defends the ante-bellum South as possessing unique and gratifying qualities. But he is not specific about the operation of Southern society concerning the distribution of its benefits and advantages. Contrariwise, the author never hesitates to damn the industrial society of the North, carefully citing black marks against it. Indeed, the repetition of the preceding views about the two sections suggests that Mr. Craven writes with a definite Southern bias.

The author's reluctance to analyze slavery objectively is also borne out by these essays. He agrees that slavery caused the war, but seldom refers to the institution again except insofar as it fed the fires of abolitionism. And as he cites the rise of the abolitionists,

blame for the war is shifted from slavery to the abolitionists' attack upon Negro enslavement.

Finally, the author states that the outbreak of the Civil War represents a failure of the American democratic process. He writes as if war, even civil war, is foreign to a democracy, overlooking the fact that the American Revolution created America. It certainly can be argued that instead of constituting a failure of the nation's democracy, the Civil War, however regrettable, exhibited the strength of the republic. The war, after all, eradicated a great evil.

The book does not have a bibliography or an index.

S. SYDNEY BRADFORD

*National Park Service
Philadelphia*

After Slavery: The Negro in South Carolina During Reconstruction, 1861-1877. By JOEL WILLIAMSON. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965. ix, 442. \$7.50.

The locale of this book is South Carolina but the insights to be gleaned from it apply in large measure to much of the South during Reconstruction. It is essentially a study in race relations, and as such it is an important book. The fixed race relations of ante-bellum days became unfixed after emancipation and Confederate defeat, and the status of the freedman—soon to become a citizen and possibly an officeholder—was impossible to determine in a way mutually satisfactory to victor and vanquished. It was a novel situation, indeed, with no time for advance planning. It was a condition, not a theory, that faced both races; poverty, bitterness, ignorance, and the various evidences of federal power did not provide an ameliorating climate for a new order of society. What was to be done, and how it was to be done, waited on trial and error; it waited also on what the dominant political power conceived to be the national interest.

Needless to say, the theme of race adjustments, under such circumstances, and touching every aspect of society, is a weighty one, but Professor Williamson has grasped it with both hands and a realistic mind. He is thoughtful and analytical rather than polemical; he writes with a full measure of sympathy for the colored race, but bearing in mind that he is writing in the context of today's attitudes, it may be said that he has been remarkably impartial. He traces the social and economic progress of the Negro from the landing of federal troops at Port Royal in the fall of 1861 through the political end of Reconstruction. His conclusion is that "Reconstruction was for the Negroes of South Carolina a period

of unequalled progress." He believes that the non-political liberties of the Negro continued to grow after Reconstruction, and that his political failures were greatly exaggerated by the Redeemers.

Even though Reconstruction discredited the Negro politically, he proved adept at using his power, and especially the power to tax, to further his own interests. The greatest failure—and this was fundamental—was in the matter of land ownership for the freedmen. However radical the Congress may have seemed, it had no desire to attack property, and after the Republican state government was established the land program bogged down in mismanagement and fraud. Inevitably the great majority of Negroes must live on the land. How they brought pressure upon their employers and in good part seized the initiative in evolving a labor and tenant relationship reasonably satisfactory to themselves, and how they were determined to avoid any of the earmarks of slavery in this relationship, is presented in instructive detail. The white man eventually concluded that the labor of the black man was desirable, even preferable, and that after the period of early adjustment he worked as well under freedom as slavery.

In the matter of religion the Negro wanted his own segregated church (which only the Presbyterians were especially reluctant to grant), and in education he wanted integration. How he got the one and not the other casts a revealing light on both races. The failure to educate, not merely to integrate, meant that even at the peak only about one-half the school age children were in school. Professor Williamson stresses the force of the Negro community in the life of the state. Even in the realm of politics it was the church, the school, and the missionaries, more than the agencies of the federal government, that created the Republican party. Initially the white conservatives did not try to win the political loyalty of the newly enfranchised Negro, and when they did try it was too late, but chances of success at any time were small indeed. Since prejudice has seldom been a one-way street, there was, of course, Negro prejudice against the whites.

"The physical separation of the races was the most revolutionary change in relations between whites and Negroes in South Carolina during Reconstruction." And, paradoxically, this tendency for each race to dissociate itself from the other could be relatively peaceful because for so long they had lived together. Again, paradoxically, as the races separated the Negro gave up his African civilization (though not his pride of race) and sought to imitate the white civilization. There were class distinctions among the Negroes; ex-slaves were inclined to distrust the ante-bellum free Negroes; mulattoes were inclined to consider themselves superior; there were

economic and occupational distinctions; native politicians were distrustful of Northern-born Negro politicians, and, for that matter, their white colleagues.

This brief review cannot do justice to the rich content of this study. The author has been indefatigable in ferreting out little used manuscript sources, and he has the knack of illustrating his points with concrete examples. He writes with style, though too many typographical errors slipped by, and he really should not misspell Cheves. We were surprised not to see Henry W. Ravenel's *Private Journal* in the bibliography (although some Ravenel letters to Taveau are cited), and we think he would have been rewarded had he examined the enormous file of the American Missionary Association at Fisk University. The paucity of our criticisms must suggest, again, the exceptional merit of this study.

ROBERT H. WOODY

Duke University

The Gleam of Bayonets: The Battle of Antietam and the Maryland Campaign of 1862. By JAMES V. MURFIN; maps by JAMES D. BOWLBY; introduction by JAMES I. ROBERTSON, JR. New York: Thomas Yoseloff, 1965. Illustrated. 451. \$12.

Sharpsburg, or as the Federals usually called it, Antietam, has always been recognized as one of the most important battles of the American Civil War. Still, for reasons not yet determined, it has been the most neglected of all major engagements of America's greatest conflict. The volume here reviewed is the first authoritative, book-length study of the campaign that culminated in the bloodiest single day's fighting of our nation's deadliest war. Fortunately it is a good book.

It is also a first book, of a young man. The author is not an academic scholar, trained in historical method and steeped in the practice and tradition of the footnote fraternity. Rather, he is a business man who holds the position of sales manager for the Kiplinger Washington Editors. He is a native of Maryland and for more than twenty years he has lived at Hagerstown, in the shadow of Sharpsburg. He has saturated himself in the lore and literature of the battle; he has trod many times the approach routes used by the opposing forces; and he has made first hand explorations of the terrain over which they fought. He has also queried residents of the area and consulted experts, far and near, on the various aspects of the campaign. Thus he has made himself an authority on the subject. What is no less important, he has mastered the ability to

communicate his abundant knowledge and his ideas in a style that is both comprehensible and vivid.

Sharpsburg, as Mr. Murfin clearly shows, was a poorly managed battle. Indeed, it was a conglomerate of many engagements rather than a single, integrated action. Determination of the site was not as much a matter of chance as was the case in the Gettysburg campaign, but neither contestant had any idea when the Antietam operation was launched by Lee early in September 1862 that a great battle would be fought in the quiet Maryland community. And, if McClellan had been anything but a thoroughly incompetent army commander, Lee's forces would have been crushed in detail before they had a chance to pull themselves together.

Mr. Murfin is severely critical of McClellan. About the only favorable comment he has for "Little Mac" is that he was able to arouse enthusiastic affection among the common soldiers. He castigates McClellan for his slowness in exploiting the tremendous advantage accruing to him from discovery of Lee's famous lost order dividing the Southern forces. He also condemns the Northern leader for tardiness in other vital matters; for overestimating Confederate strength; for failing to seek accurate information about terrain and enemy movements; for committing his forces in dribbles rather than in the fullness of their overwhelming numbers; and for failing to *command* them in their valiant effort of September 17. Time after time on that day, as on previous occasions, McClellan threw away the chance to destroy Lee's army and bring the war to an early conclusion. At least that is the conclusion of Mr. Murfin and he presents his case with a cogency which leaves little ground for those who would refute him.

His judgement of Lee's generalship is generally favorable, though it is by no means uncritical. He questions the soundness of Lee's decision to fragment his army in the face of a force so vastly superior to his own, even with due allowance for McClellan's known timidity. He also finds fault with Lee for his failure to move more promptly after learning that McClellan had obtained possession of the lost order, and for underestimating the stamina and morale of the Union rank and file.

The author correctly sees Sharpsburg as a soldiers' battle. And it is for the enlisted men and their immediate superiors that he has the highest praise. From letters, diaries, reminiscences and official reports he cites numerous instances of unfaltering determination, heroic endurance and resplendent valor. Especially noteworthy is his portrayal of the role of the artillery.

Occasionally the style is a bit breezy or awkward, but it is never dull. In treating of larger matters of statesmanship and strategy,

the author is not as convincing as he is when dealing with the campaign proper. But in fulfilling the basic requirements of telling the reader what happened and why in the Maryland campaign of September 1862 Mr. Murfin acquits himself in a manner that merits the appreciation of all who have a serious interest in the American conflict of a century ago.

BELL I. WILEY

*Harmsworth Professor of American History
Oxford University*

The Teaching of American History in High Schools. By MAURICE G. BAXTER, ROBERT H. FERRELL, JOHN E. WILTZ. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964. 160. \$3.

Books in American History, A Basic List for High Schools. By JOHN E. WILTZ. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964. 150. \$1.

Although one might disagree with the authors' proposed solutions, secondary school American History teachers cannot dispute the problems brought to light in the first of these short volumes. This report, sponsored by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., is a result of a study of the teaching of American History in high schools throughout the state of Indiana. Through close contact with high school teachers, interviews with teachers, students and librarians, and detailed questionnaires sent to every history teacher and high school librarian, a thorough study has been made of the quality of the teaching of American History in the state. Since most of the weaknesses in the teaching of American History pointed up in Indiana are unquestionably prevalent in other states, it would be well for all interested parties throughout the nation to read this report.

The primary reasons discovered for the lack of quality in American History teaching in Indiana revolve around the teacher. Too often American History teaching positions are filled by default after other posts, such as in science and mathematics, are filled more carefully. Too few American History teachers have studied in the field on the graduate level, and many have had but sparse preparation in any field of history even on the undergraduate level. Because of the lack of knowledge of the basic literature in the field, many teachers are forced to an almost complete reliance upon the textbook. Then too, American History teachers seem to be more in the habit of not reading in the field than doing so, and herein is the main problem of the high school course.

Another important area treated by this report is the high school

library. In many cases the typical high school library is "a little-used appendage" of the school. Also, the quality of the books in many libraries is poor. One of the authors, John E. Wiltz, has prepared a second volume, entitled *Books in American History, A Basic List for High Schools*, for exactly this reason. This book includes one hundred selected titles, with a brief description of each, as a starting point for any school library. It would seem that these suggested titles are more than adequate for starting. Possibly an even simpler beginning would be for a library to purchase a few of the Historical Series, such as the Chicago History of American Civilization Series, the Amherst Series, or the New American Nation Series. Some of the books included in these series are mentioned in author Wiltz's selected one hundred.

One cannot help but be impressed with the observation by the authors that quality American History courses and proper use of the library go hand in hand. The teacher must not only cooperate with the librarian to insure that there exists an intelligent book ordering program, but he must use these books in his instruction. Furthermore, the teacher must come into the library often himself, not only to be acquainted with what the library has, but to see what his students are doing.

REDMOND C. S. FINNEY

Gilman School
Baltimore, Md.

BOOKS RECEIVED FOR REVIEW

- The Enterprising Colonials: Society on the Eve of the Revolution.* By WILLIAM S. SACHS and ARI HOOGENBOOM. Chicago: Argonaut, Inc., 1965. xi, 236. \$8.50.
- Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality 1780-1845.* By DONALD G. MATTHEWS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965. xi, 329. \$7.50.
- Turner, Bolton and Webb: Three Historians of the American Frontier.* By WILBUR R. JACOBS, JOHN W. CAUGHEY, and JOE B. FRANTZ. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965. xiii, 113. \$2.95.
- A University is Born.* By MARGARET BYRNSIDE BALLARD, M.D. Union, Margaret Byrnside Ballard, M.D., 1965. xi, 308. \$7.50.
- Fisher Ames, Federalist and Statesman, 1758-1808.* By WINFRED E. A. BERNHARD. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture at Williamsburg. xiii, 372. \$8.75.
- The Strange Career of Jim Crow.* By C. VANN WOODWARD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966. Second revised edition. xiii, 205. \$4.50 cloth; \$1.50 paper.
- The Triumphant Empire: The Rumbling of the Coming Storm, 1766-1770.* By LAWRENCE HENRY GIPSON. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965. Volume XI of *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*. Ixix, 579, Index. \$10.
- The Triumphant Empire. Britain Sails Into the Storm, 1770-1776.* By LAWRENCE HENRY GIPSON. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965. Volume XII of *The British Empire Before the American Revolution*. Ivii, 372, Index. \$10.
- The Second Party System. Party Formation in the Jacksonian Era.* By RICHARD P. MCCORMICK. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1966. x, 389. \$7.50.
- The Battle of Trenton.* By SAMUEL STELLE SMITH. Monmouth Beach, N. J.: Philip Freneau Press, 1965. 36. \$4.95.
- Writing Southern History: Essays in Historiography in Honor of Fletcher M. Green.* Edited by ARTHUR S. LINK & REMBRANDT W. PATRICK. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1965. x, 502. \$12.

- The Prose Works of William Byrd of Westover: Narratives of a Colonial Virginian.* Edited by LOUIS B. WRIGHT. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1966. vii, 438. \$9.75.
- Lord Dartmouth and the American Revolution.* By B. D. BARGAR. Columbia, S. C.: The University of South Carolina Press, 1965. ix, 219. \$6.50.
- Lucas Genealogy.* Compiled and published by ANABELLE KEMP. Los Angeles, 1964. xiii, 495. \$15.
- The Colonial Merchant: Sources and Readings.* Compiled and edited by STUART BRUCHEY. The Forces in American Economic Growth Series. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966. viii, 199. \$2.95, paper.
- Progressivism and Postwar Disillusionment, 1898-1928.* Edited by DAVID A. SHANNON. Vol. 6 of *A Documentary History of American Life*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. vii, 383. \$2.95 paper; \$4.95 cloth.
- John Roach, Maritime Entrepreneur. The Years As Naval Contractor, 1862-1886.* By LEONARD ALEXANDER SWANN, JR. Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1965. xv, 301. \$7.50.
- Benjamin Franklin Isherwood, Naval Engineer. The Years As Engineer in Chief, 1861-1869.* By EDWARD WILLIAM SLOAN, III. Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1965. xiii, 299. \$7.50.
- The Revolution of American Conservatism: The Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy.* By DAVID HACKETT FISCHER. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. xx, 455. \$8.95.
- They Came from Germany: The Stories of Famous German-Americans.* By DIETER CUNZ. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1966. 178. \$3.50.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Congress of the International Council on Archives—The Organizing Committee for the 1966 Extraordinary Congress of the International Council on Archives has announced that it will invite a limited number of observers in addition to the official delegates. The Congress will meet in Washington, D.C., from May 10 to 13 to discuss the theme "Archives for Scholarship: Encouraging Greater Ease of Access." Four working sessions will be devoted to: Liberalization of Restrictions on Access to Archives; National Documentary Publication Programing; Microreproduction of Archives for Reference and Publication Purposes; and International Cooperation in Facilitating Access to Archives. A final session will consider resolutions for concrete action growing out of the working sessions. With the U. S. National Archives and Records Service as host, in cooperation with the Society of American Archivists, some 125 national archivists and other leading figures of the world archival community will participate as official delegates. For further information contact Mr. Ken Munden, Director, Special Projects Staff, National Archives and Records Service, Washington, D. C. 20408.

The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission announces the Tenth Annual Seminar in Pennsylvania History to be held June 21-24, 1966, when the following subjects will be presented: "Stirrings of Revolution"; "Tin Can Archaeology"; "Pennsylvania Canals"; "Painting in Pennsylvania"; Pennsylvania Antiques: 1966 Edition"; "Genealogy in Pennsylvania"; "Historic American Costume"; and "Historical Restoration and Photography." Inquire: Pennsylvania Farm Museum, Lancaster, Pa.

Mary Bird—I would appreciate information concerning the parents and other ancestors of Mary Bird, born 1787, died March 3, 1849, married Samuel Davidson, son of John Davidson, probably in Baltimore. Buried with husband at All Hallows, Birdsville, Md. Mary Bird was the mother of Margaret Davidson who married Basil Duckett Hall of Anne Arundel County.

Thos. I. Hall
16738 Bollinger Dr.
Pacific Palisades, Calif. 90272

Inns and taverns—I am searching for source material concerning early New England colonial inns and taverns: their outdoor signs, their colorful wooden plaque menus and recipes, guest rules and regulations and any comforts that may have been afforded the ladies who had to travel during that period of American history. It is hoped that such information may be located in old family bibles, diaries, letters and notes, and even old recipe files; perhaps even through the memories of those whose ancestors handed down fascinating stories of another day and time which were remembered from one generation to the next. All letters received shall be answered and all contributions given proper and full credit in my book on publication. Any and all suggestions as to other source material or artifacts on display in museums and libraries shall be especially welcome.

Chet L. Switell
6274 Sunset Blvd.
Hollywood 28, Calif.

National Trust for Historic Preservation—Twelve fellowships and openings for six non-fellows to attend a Seminar for Historical Administrators June 19—July 29 in Williamsburg, Va., will be available, according to an announcement made by William J. Murtagh, director of the Department of Education of the National Trust. The course for graduate students interested in administrative careers in museums and historical agencies is co-sponsored by the National Trust, Colonial Williamsburg, the American Association for State and Local History and the American Association of Museums. Each fellowship will carry a stipend of \$450.00 for qualified graduate students with one year of graduate training in American history, American studies, American art and architectural history, and allied fields. Six non-fellows, selected from qualified applicants and already actively engaged in work in this field, will be admitted at their own expense.

National Trust for Historic Preservation
815 — 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006

Maryland House and Garden Pilgrimage—The schedule for the 1966 Pilgrimage is as follows: *April 28*: Cecil Co.; *April 29*: Talbot Co.; *April 30*: Queen Anne's Co.; *May 1*: Anne Arundel Co.; *May 3*: Harford Co.; *May 4*: Frederick Co.; *May 5*: Poplar Hill Walking

Tour (Baltimore suburban); May 6: Prince George's; May 7: Charles Co.; May 8: Calvert Co.; May 14 and 15: Chesapeake Bay Cruises to Chestertown, Md. For further information call or write: Pilgrimage Headquarters, Room 223, Sheraton-Belvedere Hotel, Baltimore, Md. 21202. Tel: 837-0228.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION (*Act of October 23, 1962; Section 4369, Title 39, United States Code*) 1. Date of Filing: Sept. 10, 1965. 2. Title of Publication: Maryland Historical Magazine. 3. Frequency of Issue: Quarterly. 4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor, and Managing Editor, Publisher: Maryland Historical Society, 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201; Editor: Dr. Richard Walsh, Department of History, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007; Managing Editor: Harold R. Manatee, 201 West Monument St., Baltimore, Md. 21201. 7. Owner: Maryland Historical Society. No stock—non-profit organization. 8. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and Other Security Holders Owning or Holding 1 Percent or More of Total Amount of Bonds, Mortgages or Other Securities: None. 10. A. Total No. Copies Printed (Quarterly): 3,800. B. Paid Circulation (1.) Sales Through Dealers and Carriers, Street Vendors and Counter Sales: None; (2.) Mail Subscriptions (Memberships): 3,214. C. Total Paid Circulation: 3,214. D. Free Distribution (Schools and Libraries): 450. E. Total Distribution: 3,664. F. Office Use, Left-over, Unaccounted, Spoiled After Printing: 136. G. Total: 3,800.

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL SOCIETY
Harold R. Manatee, *Director*

CONTRIBUTORS

S. SYDNEY BRADFORD is a member of the National Park Service. Among his contributions to Maryland and American history was his work on the restoration of Fort McHenry. He has written articles for the *Journal of Southern History*, the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* and this *Magazine*.

RICHARD W. GRIFFIN, former editor of the *Textile History Review* has published *A History of Danville, Kentucky, 1785-1965*, and is at present engaged in research for a book on the history of the textile industry in North Carolina. He is Professor of American History at Ashland College, Ohio.

RICHARD R. DUNCAN is Assistant Professor of History and Political Science at the University of Richmond. He published "Maryland Methodists and the Civil War" in the December, 1964 number of this *Magazine*.

AUBREY C. LAND, Professor of History at the University of Maryland, is a student of early American History. He published *The Dulanys of Maryland* in 1955.

The Cover Picture is taken from the Baltimore Directory of 1824. It illustrates an advertisement by one William Gist, of Pratt Street Wharf, who was a manufacturer of paints and obviously very much in favor of protective tariffs espoused by Henry Clay and other national supporters of home manufacturing.